DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 265 TM 001 169

AUTHOR Holmes, Douglas; And Others
TITLE Drug Use and Users. Drug Use in Matched Groups of Hippies and Non Hippies. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Center for Community Research, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 221p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Tests; Demography; *Drug Abuse; *Drug Addiction; Family Background; Field Interviews; Lysergic Acid Diethylamide; Marihuana; Measurement Instruments; Narcotics; Political Attitudes; *Psychological Characteristics; Religious Factors; Research Methodology; Sedatives; Sex Differences; Sexuality; Statistical Analysis; Stimulants; *Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Hippies

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to provide descriptive data on several samples of drug users and to compare these with non-drug users. The study focused on the characteristics of four groups: hippies, weekend hippies ("weekenders"), non-hippie drug users, and non-hippie non-users. Information was collected from study participants to provide descriptive data in the following areas: family backgrounds, their drug orientation and practices, attitudes and beliefs reflecting alienation, and their sexual orientation and practices. See TM 001 171 for the instrument used. (Author/DLG)

ED 061265

DRUG USE AND USERS

FINAL REPORT OF A TWO YEAR STUDY SUPPORTED, IN PART BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH, GRANT NO. 5R01–MH16161–02, ENTITLED DRUG USE IN MATCHED GROUPS OF HIPPIES AND NON-HIPPIES.

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY RESEARCH
33 WEST 60th STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DOUGLAS HOLMES, Ph.D.
DIRECTOR

TM 001 169

MEMBER AGENCY OF THE ASSOCIATED YM-YWHAS OF GREATER NEW YORK

DRUG USE IN MATCHED GROUPS OF HIPPIES AND NON HIPPIES

(NIMH GRANT #5R01-MH16161-02)

Douglas Holmes, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

Theo Solomon
Field Surveys Director

Report written by:

Douglas Holmes, Ph.D.
Monica Holmes, Ph.D.

1971

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY RESEARCH
33 West 60th Street
New York, N.Y. 10023

DRUG USE IN MATCHED GROUPS OF
HIPPIES AND NON HIPPIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the study 1

B. Aims of the study 2

II. METHOD OF PROCEDURE 4

A. Study sample 4

B. Measuring instruments and techniques 9
1. Interview schedule 9
2. Training of interviewers 10

C. Time table 11

III. RESULTS 11

A. Family background and characteristics of study participants 12
Summary 56

B. Drug orientation and practices 57
Summary 116

C. Alienation 118
1. Family and friends 118
2. Alienation from existing social institutions 131
3. Alienation from traditionally valued goals and concepts 152
Summary 163

D. Experience with and attitudes toward sexuality 165
1. Personal aspects of sexuality 165
2. Attitudes toward and opinions about sexuality 175
Summary 197

E. Summary and conclusions 198

BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION:

A. Background for the Study:

The background work for the study, of which this is a final report, began early in 1967. At that time, staff interest in the topic of drug abuse and the seemingly related problems of alienation and disengagement reflected growing public and professional awareness of the magnitude of these problems. The first results of studies dealing both with what had become relatively widespread use of drugs, and with those young people who had disengaged themselves from the mainstream of society, had just emerged in the years 1966 through 1968. One speaks of that period, only a few years past, as another generation in terms of the evolution of drug use. Thus, our involvement reflected public and professional concern about the growing social problem of drug abuse.

Feelings of concern regarding drug use and alienation were exacerbated by the latent suspicion - soon to become growing awareness - that the drug users included many whom we traditionally would have regarded as our leadership youth. Then, as now, it is a matter of concern and incredulity to be confronted with the fact that often the brightest, the most gifted, and the potentially most productive of our youth are becoming more and more heavily involved in a drug culture which may or may not constitute part of a philosophical and/or emotional alignment with a counter-culture. Clearly, drug use and its concomitants seemed to be part of a phenomenon which, numerically at least, represented something of a revolution. Growing interest in the phenomenon stemmed both from academic interest and deep concern with the psychological and social ramifications of drug involvement.

The formal project began in mid-1968. Our proposal for this project represented the direct outgrowth of the following prior experience, which occurred in 1967 and 1968. In early 1967, the staff of the Center for Community Research established contact with indigenous hippie leadership in the East Village section of New York City. As a result, we were asked by the staff of an underground newspaper (The East Village Other) to analyze drug use data collected from among readers of the newspaper. Among the 230 individuals who had responded to The East Village Other questionnaire, drug use data were strikingly similar to that collected during our later pilot study and during the major study itself. That is, almost all of the respondents reported using marijuana, and, in addition, almost all reported having used between four and five other drugs. Similar to groups queried at a later date, many had initiated drug use at a very early age: a number reported having started at age 12.

Following this review of secondary data, the Center undertook a study of 50 members of the New York City hippie community. This pilot study helped to establish the logical

parameters for a more comprehensive study, and demonstrated clearly that it would be possible to employ indigenous hippie interviewers to facilitate the gathering of information from among this group. Finally, this early work with members of the hippie community, all of whom were drug users, suggested that the phenomena of drugs and alienation were not a passing phase or fad, but that instead they might be regarded as precursors to a pervasive life style developing among today's adolescents and young adults.

B. Aims of the Study:

The global aim of the comprehensive descriptive study was to quantify and describe the characteristics of several groups, most particularly those which might be considered "at risk," in terms of drug use, and to compare them with non drug users. As stipulated in the grant proposal, there was an implicit hypothesis underlying the study, namely, that there are significant differences between those termed "hippies" and those termed "non hippies," in addition to the characteristics used in distinguishing and selecting samples from the two groups. As was noted in the original proposal, it would have been possible to develop a number of predictions stemming from this hypothesis. However, such experimental rigor seemed deleterious in that it would place a priori restrictions upon the nature of data collected. Instead, this was to serve as a descriptive study which would provide a wealth of data descriptive of the selected groups which could be used, in turn, to develop additional studies focusing upon various aspects of the population. Believing that drug use per se cannot be separated from the totality of individual functioning, and believing that drug use and alienation best can be described through comparison with non-drug-using and overtly less disengaged individuals, the study focused on the characteristics of four groups: hippies, weekend hippies, non-hippie drug users, and non-hippie non users. The following dimensions were established as the parameters of data collection:

1. Family background and characteristics of study participants: including socioeconomic status, religious identification, relations with other family members, perceived parental role and characteristics, political orientation, history of family disruption, and parental practices and attitudes toward alcohol and smoking;

2. Drug orientation and practices: including the extent and nature of drug use, sources for drugs, patterns of use, attitudes toward different drugs, reasons for the initiation and termination of use, and properties attributed to various drugs;

3. Alienation: including attitudes toward society and various middle class concepts, political beliefs and ideals, and individual history of friendship patterns and feelings of being an outsider at various times;

4. Sexual orientation and practices: including attitudes and opinions about sexual mores and personal history of sexual behavior.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the study and its results, it is important to make one final cautionary note. The time frame of the drug use phenomenon is very different from that of other social and personal developmental processes. The past two years, the years since the inception of this study, have witnessed a total revolution in the scope and nature of drug use - in truth, a "new generation" has developed in terms of orientation toward the use of drugs. Thus, some of the original objectives of this study have become irrelevant, and some of the findings may appear naive to the sophisticated reviewer. For example, it has become extremely difficult to define satisfactorily such terms as "user" or "non user" of drugs. At the time this study was proposed, it was generally accepted that anyone who used any drug, even at very infrequent intervals, could be classified a "user." Currently, it is no longer surprising to see someone "turning on" at a party, and it becomes much more difficult to draw such distinctions in a meaningful sense of the word. Those who would do so are reminded of the adolescents' retort that we too are drug users: we smoke, we drink, we tranquilize; in short, we use many substances to augment, or to ward off, life experience. Bearing in mind the changing nature of the phenomenon, and also the impossibility of establishing any pharmacological definition of abuse, it is hoped that the reader will understand and tolerate the somewhat a priori delineations which will be made in the body of this text.

The concept of drug use, let alone abuse, is extremely elusive. Clearly, the definition arising from a specific set of behaviors for a variety of drugs which may be available is a direct function of societal values as they relate to drug use. When planning the study one could have said with some assurance that any person who used any drug, including marijuana, at all, was a drug user. Given that connotation of the term "drug use," one could scarcely make such a statement today, at least with respect to the psychotropic drugs. In an attempt to mediate between the original intent and context of the study and rapidly changing contemporary values, we have somewhat arbitrarily defined a drug user as any person who uses marijuana at least once a month, or who has used any other drug on at least two occasions. While admittedly arbitrary, there appears no particular reason why a greater or lesser frequency of use should be taken as a criterion. Moreover, as will be developed during the course of this report, this particular differentiation does appear fruitful, in terms of the observed differences among users and non users defined in this fashion.

II. METHOD OF PROCEDURE:

A. Study Sample:

Four major divisions were made among study subjects. A form of quota samplying was used so that ultimately there would be included 100 hippies residing in the East Village, 100 non resident or weekend hippies, i.e., those who lived with their parental families or others, and who did not reside in the East Village, 100 urban non hippies, and 100 suburban non hippies. Two further stratifications were introduced into the sampling design, (1) in terms of sex, and (2)among the non-hippies in terms of their being drug users or non drug users. The original sampling design is set forth below, in Tables 1a and 1b.

Table 1. Stipulated Sample Sizes

a. Hippies and Weekenders

		Urban	Suburban
Hippie	Male	25	25
	Female	25	25
Weekender	Male	25	25
	Female	25	25

b. Non Hippies

		Urban	Suburban
User	Male	25	25
	Female	25	25
Non User	Male	25	25
	Female	25	25

The designation of individual study subjects took place as follows. First, a very general estimate was made of the total number of hippies residing in a defined area of New York City termed the "East Village," which includes all addresses lying south of 14th Street, north of Houston Street, west of

Avenue D, and east of Third Avenue. Having no reason to believe that the hippie population was other than evenly distributed throughout this area, the total number of hippies estimated to reside there (3,000) was divided by the total number of block faces in the area, providing an estimate of the number of block faces which would have to be visited in order to obtain the requisite study sample. All block faces were numbered sequentially for the entire study district; specific block face identification numbers then were selected through the application of a table of random numbers. Working from real estate maps which provided street addresses for each block face, again using a random number procedure, one specific address was selected from each block face which was to be the entry point for interviewers.

Having established a specific address, interviewers were instructed to enter the building and begin alternatively with either the top-most apartment or the apartment on the lowest floor. This within-building initial assignment was done on a purely alternating basis to avoid any possible "floor bias." Interviewers knocked on the door of each apartment on the designated floor and then progressed up or down through the house until an occupant answered the door. At that point, a screening questionnaire (criteria listed on page 6) was administered, on the basis of which it was possible to decide on the spot whether that individual fit the study definition of a hippie. If this was the case, the study interview was completed immediately. In cases where there were no hippies residing at the specified street address, interviewers next visited the street address immediately to the left of the first designated address, continuing in such fashion (if it had been necessary, completely around the block) until a hippie was located. In fact, it was never necessary to traverse more than the initially designated block face before encountering a hippie. In instances where more than one hippie lived in a particular apartment, only the individual answering the door was interviewed.

Interviews were refused on only two occasions. The first was the result of the potential respondent's allegedly feeling sick. The second was occasioned by the return of the respondent's boyfriend, who snatched the interview schedule from the interviewer's hand, tore it up, and ordered him out. Other than this, no difficulty was experienced in eliciting information from the hippie sample. A 100% check of reported interviews was undertaken by having Center professional staff visit each of the locations reported by the interviewers and ask whether the occupant had indeed been interviewed that day. No discrepancy occurred between interviewers' listings and the staff's follow-up inquiries.

A word is in order regarding the study definition of "hippie." On the basis of the earlier pilot study, it was possible to develop an operational definition of "hippieness" which then served as the basis for the determination of individual suitability for study inclusion. The criteria for inclusion, all of which had to be met by each hippie respondent, were as follows:

1. Self-perceived alienation from the goals and values of society.

2. Self-identification as hippies or "free men."

3. Identification and/or sympathy with a specific group of hippies, e.g., "diggers," "provos."

4. A life style, including dress and abode, which was that commonly associated with the hippies.

5. Identification with the "drug scene."

As noted above, information regarding these criteria was elicited at the time of first contact at the door; the formal study interview occurred only if the initial contact revealed all of these characteristics.

The selection of the weekenders or "street sceners," i.e., the non resident hippies, unfortunately could not be as methodologically sound. Indeed, it was on a somewhat "first come, first served" basis. That is, interviewers posted themselves on busy street corners within the geographic areas of the study, approaching all of those of hippie appearance whom they did not recognize as regular residents in the area. Interviewers first inquired about place of residence; if it was not in the East Village, potential respondents were then asked questions reflecting the above-listed screening criteria. If the individual proved eligible for study inclusion, he was then asked to adjourn to a nearby coffee shop to complete the interview. Here too, perhaps surprisingly, no weekender respondent refused to complete the interview. It should be pointed out that this willingness among both weekenders and hippies to participate in the study most probably was born of two factors. First of all, experience indicates that the hippies are a proselytizing group. Even when not seeking "converts," they are apt to be most eager when given an opportunity to express their views of life, drugs, etc., especially if it is to another hippie who is anything but threatening. Secondly, those interviewed were paid $5.00 each for completing the interview, which took approximately an hour. Since most of them needed money, this incentive was conducive to cooperation. Overlying both of these factors was the overt blessing given the study by hippie leaders including Abbie Hoffman, who was at that time a more localized phenomenon.

In the original design it had been planned to develop equal cell Ns representing each of the strata shown in Tables 1a and 1b; that is, there would be equal numbers of males and females, users and non users, etc. Once the study got underway, it was decided that a more fruitful approach would involve the random selection of subjects within the gross study classifications, thus providing an estimate of prevalence of drug use among non hippies. Therefore, the final study population varied slightly from that originally stipulated, as is shown below in Tables 2a and 2b.

Table 2. Actual Sample Size

a. Hippies and Weekenders

		Urban	Suburban	
Hippie	Male	37	28	
	Female	28	25	
Weekender	Male	25	25	
	Female	22	29	
				219

b. Non Hippies

		Urban	Suburban	
User	Male	50	30	
	Female	25	31	
Non User	Male	30	20	
	Female	37	23	
				246

As shown in Tables 2a and 2b, the number of subjects in the study exceeded that previously stipulated in the study design. This over-sample is reflective of the differing relative rates of subjects encountered in the various categories.

In examining Table 2b, it is particularly interesting to note that over half (55%) of the non hippies are drug users.

This is particularly noteworthy since these subjects were sampled from a "straight" population. As a matter of fact, it might be regarded as an "ultra-straight" sample, in that most of them were contacted through community centers to which they belonged: seemingly, this group would be the most straight, least radical, and least revolutionary. Every individual who met the matching characteristics was interviewed, until the total of each "line group," e.g., user males, and user females, totalled 50. As this suggests, it was hardest to find non-user males; subject interviewing continued even though all other lines were filled, until, finally, 50 male non users had been located. In Table 2b, the most over-represented single group appears to be the male users (32% of total), followed by the female non users, the female users, and the male non users, in that order. Remembering again that these data were collected over a year ago, at a time when only the very radical were asserting that as many as one-third of today's youth might be using drugs, it is particularly interesting to note the high proportion of drug users encountered. While the data were being collected, it was a standard (but not so funny) joke that we would not be able to fill our non-user cells.

While these data are interesting in terms of providing some suggestions as to prevalence of drug use among groups such as those sampled, the superfluous subjects were omitted (randomly!) before embarking on the data analyses, which were performed on the stiluplated 400 subjects. As will be discussed in a later section, analyses of the data showed no consistent differences between urban and suburban subjects; these categories therefore were collapsed prior to both the random deletion of superfluous subjects, and to the termination of data collection. That is, interviews were collected until each of the eight groups (excluding the suburban/urban stratification) had a minimum of 50 individuals.

A departure from the prescribed sampling design occurred also with regard to age; that is, initially it had been planned to include only adolescents in the study. In view of the rather widespread nature of the phenomenon and of our early experience which indicated a very wide age range among hippies and among drug users in the general population, it was decided to abandon any such constraint. Thus, the age range of those interviewed is from 14 to 35, with most respondents being in their late teens or early twenties. The mean age and standard deviation for each group are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Age Means and Standard Deviations for All of the Study Groups.

		Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Median
Hippie	Male	24.00	6.00	17.00 - 48.00	22.00
	Female	21.70	3.14	17.00 - 30.00	21.00
Weekender	Male	22.02	4.73	16.00 - 38.00	21.00
	Female	19.64	3.00	14.00 - 27.00	19.00
User	Male	22.36	3.83	17.00 - 34.00	22.00
	Female	21.78	4.19	16.00 - 30.00	21.00
Non User	Male	21.49	5.99	14.00 - 46.00	20.00
	Female	20.02	3.89	14.00 - 29.00	19.00

The turn-down rate among potential non-hippie, non-weekender respondents was again negligible. When working among these subjects, non-hippie interviewers of approximately the same age group as the respondents were employed so as to foster easy interaction. As was the case with the hippies, subjects were paid five dollars for cooperating in the data collection procedures.

One slight difficulty emerged when dealing with the non-hippie group. Whereas the "under-age" (taken to be 17 or under) hippies could be regarded as "emancipated youth" who did not require parental approval for study participation, this was not the case with non-hippie minors residing at home. Before interviewing such individuals, parental consent had to be obtained. While this did not present any specific difficulties, it did create just one more obstacle to the collection of data.

B. Measuring Instruments and Techniques:

1. Interview Schedule:

A comprehensive, highly structured interview schedule, a copy of which is appended to this report, was developed during the first six months of the project. In its final form, it

represented the Center's previous work in this field, as well as the suggestions of others who were engaged in similar research at the time.[1] The questionnaire was pre-tested and revised, based upon the pre-test results on several occasions. Due both to the highly-structured nature of the content areas, and to the very specific skip patterns involved in the body of the instrument, it was suitable for use by relatively inexperienced interviewers, after very brief training. While the nature of the instrument is such as to preclude the calculation of any reliability estimates for it as a whole, the training of interviewers included a series of interviews conducted by the trainee and by an experienced interviewer, followed by a "debriefing" session during which any differences in scoring were discussed thoroughly. The interview schedule was administered individually in a variety of settings, ranging from a busy coffee house to the privacy of a respondent's room. The respondents appeared to take the procedure seriously, little defensive behavior was manifested, and the impression of the interviewers was that respondents were sincerely cooperating in the provision of information. Interviews were conducted at almost any time of day or night. Often it was impossible to meet with subjects during the day, and therefore interviews were scheduled during evening hours. At all times the emphasis was on suiting the convenience of the respondents. The highly satisfactory response rate doubtless was due in part to this orientation of interview staff.

2. Training of Interviewers:

Hippie interviewers were engaged with the help of Abbie Hoffman, a prominent leader in the hippie community. Ultimately, eight indigenous interviewers were trained and used for collecting all hippie data. Each of them had graduated from college, several had received graduate training, and two had the Master's degree in relevant social sciences. During an initial briefing session, the reasons for conducting the study were explored fully and openly with the indigenous interviewing staff. We felt that we had nothing to hide, i.e., we were interested in the phenomenon as a way to helping those who were experiencing difficulties in adjusting to contemporary social stress, and we were interested in making their position clear to the 'straight' world, a desire which, at that time at least, was shared by the more responsible contingent among the hippies. Following a number of training and practice sessions dealing with the administration of the

---

[1]We wish to acknowledge the work of F. Cheek and S. Perlman, with whom we consulted and from whom we borrowed items for inclusion in the final questionnaire.

interview schedule, the interviewers were familiarized with the general sampling routine and given their interviewing assignments. They were paid on the basis of completed interviews; reported contacts were verified by study staff, as mentioned earlier in this report. These indigenous interviewers were most helpful, both in terms of reaching and engaging the target population, and in terms of translating the questions to the respondents. While there might have been a tendency for the respondents to "put on" a "straight" interviewer, this clearly was not the case among the interviewers recruited for collecting the hippie data.

Among the non-hippie respondent group, Center staff interviewers were used. They too were trained in the use of this particular data-gathering instrument, and experienced little difficulty in obtaining the information from their assigned respondents.

C. Time Table:

Although introducing the possibility of a time bias in the results of the study, the nature of the interviewing procedure necessitated the collection of data from the different groups sequentially. That is, all of the resident hippie, and then the weekender (or "street scener"), data were collected first. Following this, the urban non-hippie data were collected, followed finally by the suburban non-hippie data.

The creation of the final interview schedule, and the selection and training of interviewers took the first six months of the project. Data then were collected from among the hippie groups during the following six months, and from among the non-hippie groups during the ensuing ten months. Thus, the hippie data all were collected in 1969, and the non-hippie data in the period 1969-1970.

III. RESULTS:

Before beginning a discussion of the results, it perhaps would be helpful to outline the format of this discussion. The study results are presented in four sections as follows: (A) family background, (B) drug orientation and practices, (C) alienation, and (D) sexual orientation and practices. Not all possible relationships will be explored. There are so many possibilities, given data of the type available in this study, that the preparation of this report cannot await all possible analyses. However, the analyses will continue, and the results will be written up at a later date.

FAMILY BACKGROUND AND CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS

One further note is in order. Initially, the study sample had been dichotomized into "urban" or "suburban" origin or current residence. Chi Square analyses applied to this categorization indicated that this was a fruitless dichotomization: that is, only one significant Chi Square occurred among 72 items tested at random, and so this stratification was abandoned.

A. Family Background and Characteristics of Study Participants:

Examination of the demographic characteristics of participants will be helpful in answering the oft-repeated question: "Just who are these people, anyway?" In presenting the following data, primary reliance has been placed upon Chi Square analyses of data. The application of this relatively low-power test reflects the nominal and ordinal nature of the data.

At the time when the hippies were being interviewed, they were viewed by some segments of society with admiration and approbation. That is, it was generally felt in "liberal" circles that the hippies were the disenchanted offspring of upper socioeconomic status families. It has been suggested repeatedly that the modal hippie is the frustrated and hence rebellious artifact of affluence - that somehow the hippie as a social phenomenon reflects the dissolution of the elite. With this in mind, it is particularly interesting to review the data presented below in Tables 4a and 4b.

Table 4a. Socioeconomic Status Classification of Subjects' Parental Families (according to the Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958, criteria).

		SES Category						
		(High) 1	2	3	4	5	6	(Low) 7
Hippie	Male	7 14%	6 12%	14 28%	5 10%	6 12%	4 8%	2 4%
	Female	17 34%	8 16%	11 22%	5 10%	5 10%	2 4%	0 0%
Weekender	Male	6 12%	14 28%	4 8%	10 20%	7 14%	4 8%	3 6%
	Female	12 24%	7 14%	12 24%	8 16%	5 10%	3 6%	3 6%
User	Male	19 38%	13 26%	6 12%	5 10%	3 6%	3 6%	0 0%
	Female	15 30%	14 28%	10 20%	6 12%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%
Non User	Male	12 24%	8 16%	15 30%	3 6%	5 10%	3 6%	1 2%
	Female	10 20%	10 20%	13 26%	9 18%	1 2%	5 10%	0 0%
Totals		98 25%	80 20%	85 21%	51 13%	33 8%	25 6%	11 3%

Table 4b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 4a.

		SES		
		1 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 7
Hippie	Male	O = 13.00 E = 20.45	O = 19.00 E = 15.62	O = 12.00 E = 7.93
	Female	O = 25.00 E = 22.31	O = 16.00 E = 17.04	O = 7.00 E = 8.65
Weekender	Male	O = 20.00 E = 22.31	O = 14.00 E = 17.04	O = 14.00 E = 8.65
	Female	O = 19.00 E = 23.24	O = 20.00 E = 17.75	O = 11.00 E = 9.01
User	Male	O = 32.00 E = 22.77	O = 11.00 E = 17.40	O = 6.00 E = 8.83
	Female	O = 29.00 E = 22.77	O = 16.00 E = 17.40	O = 4.00 E = 8.83
Non User	Male	O = 20.00 E = 21.84	O = 18.00 E = 16.69	O = 9.00 E = 8.47
	Female	O = 20.00 E = 22.31	O = 22.00 E = 17.04	O = 6.00 E = 8.65

Chi Square = 26.0674 for 14 d.f.
$p<.05$

As will be noted from an examination of Table 4b, in which the Chi Square on the data presented is significant at the .05 level, fewer male hippies (26%) and fewer weekenders of both sexes (male = 40%, female = 38%) come from upper middle class backgrounds than would be expected on the basis of chance alone. Conversely, more than would be expected by chance among the male hippies and both groups of weekenders come from relatively lower socioeconomic status family backgrounds. As will be commented on at greater length later in this report, more of the female hippies come from relatively higher SES backgrounds.

Quite the opposite is true with respect to the non hippie drug users. That is, far more of the users[1] than would be expected on a chance basis report upper SES family backgrounds (61%), while among those reporting no drug use the socioeconomic status distribution approximates that which would be expected on the basis of chance alone. However, in viewing the data as a whole, it is interesting to note that one is dealing with a predominantly middle class group. That is, 34% of respondents come from middle SES backgrounds, while fewer than one in ten come from lower SES families.

[1]Throughout this report, the term "users" refers to the non-hippie drug-using sample, and "non users" refers to the non-hippie non-drug-using sample.

We see here also the first appearance of a phenomenon which is to recur throughout the data, i.e., the "pattern-breaking" by the female hippies. In this instance, we see that the female hippies are the only group other than the users who are over-represented in the SES 1 and 2 categories. Looking at Table 4a, we see that only among the female hippies and the male users does over one-third report coming from the highest SES families. Taken by itself, this could be regarded as a chance phenomenon, however, later data will bear out the seeming "difference" manifested by this group. Particularly in the context of today's "Women's Lib" movement, it is interesting to speculate that it may be just this group which is most aptly described as the purposeless victims of affluence. It will be interesting in any event to focus on this group throughout the analyses.

The non hippies, i.e., the users versus the non users, were compared in terms of SES. The results of this comparison are shown below in Table 5.

Table 5. Results of Chi Square Analysis of Socioeconomic Status Among Non Hippie Users and Non Hippie Non Users.

	SES		
	1 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 7
User	O = 61.00 E = 51.28	O = 27.00 E = 34.02	O = 10.00 E = 12.69
Non User	O = 40.00 E = 49.72	O = 40.00 E = 32.98	O = 15.00 E = 12.31

Chi Square = 7.8440 for 2 d.f.
$p<.05$

The above results suggest that there is a major difference between expected and observed SES frequencies between the users and the non users. This interpretation is bolstered by further Chi Square analyses which show that: (1) there is no significant difference in SES according to sex of respondent, (2) no significant difference among groups among females only, (3) no significant effect among hippies as contrasted with weekenders, and (4) no significant effect found as a function of sex within each of the four groups. Thus, in reviewing the socioeconomic status data, it would seem that the sources of significance lie in surprisingly smaller proportions of hippies coming from upper SES homes, and the equally surprising "surplus" of users coming from such homes, particularly as contrasted with the non-hippie non-user group.

Along somewhat the same lines, the results of Chi Square analyses applied to data on parental vocational and financial advancement, presented below in Tables 6 and 7, also are interesting.

Table 6a. Reported Parental Vocational Advancement.

		Same Position	Advancing Slowly	Advancing Quickly	Lesser Position
Hippie	Male	32 64%	7 14%	3 6%	5 10%
	Female	24 48%	14 28%	4 8%	5 10%
Weekender	Male	30 60%	7 14%	8 16%	4 8%
	Female	34 68%	9 18%	4 8%	0 0%
User	Male	25 50%	12 24%	8 16%	2 4%
	Female	26 52%	10 20%	10 20%	1 2%
Non User	Male	27 54%	10 20%	7 14%	1 2%
	Female	22 44%	13 26%	8 16%	5 10%
Totals		220 55%	82 21%	52 13%	23 6%

Table 6b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 6a.

		Same Position or Lesser Position	Advancing Slowly or Rapidly
Hippie	Male	O = 37.00 E = 30.29	O = 10.00 E = 16.71
	Female	O = 29.00 E = 30.29	O = 18.00 E = 16.71
Weekender	Male	O = 34.00 E = 31.58	O = 15.00 E = 17.42
	Female	O = 34.00 E = 30.29	O = 13.00 E = 16.71
User	Male	O = 27.00 E = 30.29	O = 20.00 E = 16.71
	Female	O = 27.00 E = 30.29	O = 20.00 E = 16.71
Non User	Male	O = 28.00 E = 29.01	O = 17.00 E = 15.99
	Female	O = 27.00 E = 30.94	O = 21.00 E = 17.06

Chi Square = 9.6517 for 7 d.f.
NS

Table 7a. Reported Parental Financial Advancement.

		Same	More	Less
Hippie	Male	17 34%	20 40%	6 12%
	Female	15 30%	24 48%	8 16%
Weekender	Male	18 36%	23 46%	7 14%
	Female	22 44%	24 48%	3 6%
User	Male	11 22%	31 62%	4 8%
	Female	12 24%	32 64%	4 8%
Non User	Male	9 18%	32 64%	5 10%
	Female	14 28%	24 48%	8 16%
Totals		118 30%	210 53%	45 11%

Table 7b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 7a.

		Same	More	Less
Hippie	Male	O = 17.00 E = 13.57	O = 20.00 E = 24.14	O = 6.00 E = 5.29
	Female	O = 15.00 E = 14.83	O = 24.00 E = 26.39	O = 8.00 E = 5.78
Weekender	Male	O = 18.00 E = 15.14	O = 23.00 E = 26.95	O = 7.00 E = 5.90
	Female	O = 22.00 E = 15.78	O = 24.00 E = 28.07	O = 4.00 E = 6.15
User	Male	O = 11.00 E = 14.51	O = 31.00 E = 25.83	O = 4.00 E = 5.66
	Female	O = 12.00 E = 15.14	O = 32.00 E = 26.95	O = 4.00 E = 5.90
Non User	Male	O = 9.00 E = 14.51	O = 32.00 E = 25.83	O = 5.00 E = 5.66
	Female	O = 14.00 E = 14.51	O = 24.00 E = 25.83	O = 8.00 E = 5.66

Chi Square = 17.2132 for 14 d.f.
NS

As noted from inspection of Tables 6 and 7, the differences between observed and expected frequencies fall just short of significance on both variables. However, while bearing in mind the dangers of interpreting any non-significant departure from chance, it is interesting to note that the same general pattern holds in response to these questions as did in response to the socioeconomic status questions. That is, more of the hippie males than would be expected and all weekenders report their fathers as holding the same or a lesser position, while fewer than would be expected report their fathers as having experienced vocational advancement. Among the hippie females, and among the users and the non users, more respondents report paternal job advancement than would be expected. With regard to paternal financial advancement, only the users and the male non users report, with greater frequency than would be expected, that their fathers have advanced financially on their jobs.

Even more striking are the data reflecting subjects' estimates of parents' economic status, both currently and while respondents were growing up. These data are presented below, in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8a. Reported Economic Status of Parents, During Respondents' Childhood.

		Wealthy	Well-to-do	Comfortable	Just Managed	Poor
Hippie	Male	3 6%	1 2%	27 54%	12 24%	5 10%
	Female	4 8%	12 24%	24 48%	6 12%	3 6%
Weekender	Male	2 4%	11 22%	23 46%	9 18%	4 8%
	Female	3 6%	9 18%	29 58%	8 16%	1 2%
User	Male	2 4%	14 28%	24 48%	8 16%	1 2%
	Female	4 8%	11 22%	28 55%	7 14%	0 0%
Non User	Male	5 10%	10 20%	25 50%	9 18%	0 0%
	Female	2 4%	5 10%	35 71%	7 14%	0 0%
Totals		25 6%	73 18%	215 54%	66 17%	14 4%

Table 8b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 8a.

		Wealthy or Well-to-do	Comfortable	Just Managed or Poor
Hippie	Male	O = 4.00 E = 11.97	O = 27.00 E = 26.26	O = 17.00 E = 9.77
	Female	O = 16.00 E = 12.22	O = 24.00 E = 26.81	O = 9.00 E = 9.97
Weekender	Male	O = 13.00 E = 12.22	O = 23.00 E = 26.81	O = 13.00 E = 9.97
	Female	O = 12.00 E = 12.47	O = 29.00 E = 27.35	O = 9.00 E = 10.18
User	Male	O = 16.00 E = 12.22	O = 24.00 E = 26.81	O = 9.00 E = 9.97
	Female	O = 15.00 E = 12.47	O = 28.00 E = 27.35	O = 7.00 E = 10.18
Non User	Male	O = 15.00 E = 12.22	O = 25.00 E = 26.81	O = 9.00 E = 9.97
	Female	O = 7.00 E = 12.22	O = 35.00 E = 26.81	O = 7.00 E = 9.97

Chi Square = 23.5471 for 14 d.f.
NS

Table 9a. Respondents' Reports of Parents' Current Economic Status.

		Wealthy	Well-to-do	Comfortable	Just Manage	Poor
Hippie	Male	2 4%	2 4%	15 30%	5 10%	4 8%
	Female	2 4%	10 20%	16 32%	1 2%	1 2%
Weekender	Male	3 6%	6 12%	21 42%	5 10%	2 4%
	Female	2 4%	8 16%	18 36%	5 10%	1 2%
User	Male	3 6%	16 32%	18 36%	8 16%	2 4%
	Female	5 10%	10 20%	27 53%	7 14%	1 2%
Non User	Male	5 10%	14 28%	22 44%	7 14%	1 2%
	Female	1 2%	6 12%	33 67%	7 14%	0 0%
Totals		23 6%	72 18%	170 43%	45 11%	12 3%

Table 9b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 9a.

		Wealthy or Well-to-do	Comfortable	Just Manage or Poor
Hippie	Male	O = 4.00 E = 8.26	O = 15.00 E = 14.78	O = 9.00 E = 4.96
	Female	O = 12.00 E = 8.85	O = 16.00 E = 15.84	O = 2.00 E = 5.31
Weekender	Male	O = 9.00 E = 10.92	O = 21.00 E = 19.53	O = 7.00 E = 6.55
	Female	O = 10.00 E = 10.03	O = 18.00 E = 17.95	O = 6.00 E = 6.02
User	Male	O = 19.00 E = 13.87	O = 18.00 E = 24.81	O = 10.00 E = 8.32
	Female	O = 15.00 E = 14.75	O = 27.00 E = 26.40	O = 8.00 E = 8.85
Non User	Male	O = 19.00 E = 14.46	O = 22.00 E = 25.87	O = 8.00 E = 8.67
	Female	O = 7.00 E = 13.87	O = 33.00 E = 24.81	O = 7.00 E = 8.32

Chi Square = 21.7429 for 14 d.f.
NS

As seen in Tables 8 and 9, the results fall just short of statistical significance ($p<.05$ = 23.685 for 14 d.f.). Further examination of this table suggests, however, that the failure to achieve demonstrable significance may be attributed to the relatively small differences between observed and expected frequencies among the weekenders, in particular. On the other hand, there is a seemingly vast difference between the observed and expected frequencies among male hippies. That is, many fewer than would be expected report relative affluence during their childhood, while almost twice as many as would be expected report having grown up in straitened circumstances. Again, there is a reversal among the hippie females: it appears that, while hippie males are of lower socioeconomic status than are males in the other study groups, the reverse is true of the females. On the basis of these data, one could almost suggest that while for many males "hippieness" represents a flight from modest circumstances, for many females the flight is from affluence. The same general pattern of findings is to be observed in Tables 10 and 11 below.

Table 10a. Perceived Social Status of Parents During Respondents' Childhood.

		Leading Family	Upper Class	Upper-Middle Class	Middle Class	Lower-Middle Class	Lower Class	None (Dead)
Hippie	Male	3 6%	2 4%	10 20%	13 26%	13 26%	5 10%	1 2%
	Female	4 8%	3 6%	17 34%	20 40%	2 4%	2 4%	0 0%
Weekender	Male	1 2%	5 10%	13 26%	19 38%	10 20%	1 2%	0 0%
	Female	0 0%	6 12%	11 22%	25 50%	7 14%	1 2%	0 0%
User	Male	4 8%	2 4%	21 42%	17 34%	4 8%	1 2%	1 2%
	Female	1 2%	3 6%	21 41%	21 41%	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%
Non User	Male	4 8%	5 10%	19 38%	19 38%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%
	Female	0 0%	6 12%	17 35%	24 49%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%
Totals		17 4%	32 8%	129 32%	158 40%	43 11%	12 3%	3 1%

Table 10b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 10a.

		Leading Family & Upper Class	Upper-Middle Class	Middle Class	Lower-Middle & Lower Class
Hippie	Male	O = 5.00 E = 5.75	O = 10.00 E = 15.14	O = 13.00 E = 18.54	O = 18.00 E = 6.57
	Female	O = 7.00 E = 6.00	O = 17.00 E = 15.80	O = 20.00 E = 19.35	O = 4.00 E = 6.86
Weekender	Male	O = 6.00 E = 6.12	O = 13.00 E = 16.12	O = 19.00 E = 19.75	O = 11.00 E = 7.00
	Female	O = 6.00 E = 6.25	O = 11.00 E = 16.45	O = 25.00 E = 20.15	O = 8.00 E = 7.14
User	Male	O = 6.00 E = 6.12	O = 21.00 E = 16.12	O = 17.00 E = 19.75	O = 5.00 E = 7.00
	Female	O = 4.00 E = 6.25	O = 21.00 E = 16.45	O = 21.00 E = 20.15	O = 4.00 E = 7.14
Non User	Male	O = 9.00 E = 6.25	O = 19.00 E = 16.45	O = 19.00 E = 20.15	O = 3.00 E = 7.14
	Female	O = 6.00 E = 6.25	O = 17.00 E = 16.45	O = 24.00 E = 20.15	O = 3.00 E = 7.14

Chi Square = 44.0062 for 21 d.f.
$p < .05$

Table 11a. Perceived Current Social Status of Families.

		Leading Family	Upper Class	Upper-Middle Class	Middle Class	Lower-Middle Class	Lower Class	None (Dead)
Hippie	Male	2 4%	1 2%	5 10%	11 22%	4 8%	1 2%	1 2%
	Female	1 2%	2 4%	13 26%	13 26%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%
Weekender	Male	1 2%	5 10%	11 22%	15 30%	5 10%	1 2%	0 0%
	Female	0 0%	4 8%	9 18%	17 34%	4 8%	0 0%	0 0%
User	Male	4 8%	2 4%	21 42%	12 24%	5 10%	1 2%	1 2%
	Female	1 2%	5 10%	23 45%	13 26%	4 8%	4 8%	0 0%
Non User	Male	2 4%	4 8%	19 38%	17 34%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%
	Female	0 0%	3 6%	20 41%	17 35%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%
Totals		11 3%	26 7%	121 30%	115 29%	30 8%	10 3%	3 1%

Table 11b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 11a.

		Leading Family & Upper Class	Upper-Middle Class	Middle Class	Lower-Middle & Lower Class
Hippie	Male	O = 3.00 E = 2.84	O = 5.00 E = 9.28	O = 11.00 E = 8.82	O = 5.00 E = 3.07
	Female	O = 3.00 E = 3.78	O = 13.00 E = 12.37	O = 13.00 E = 11.76	O = 3.00 E = 4.09
Weekender	Male	O = 6.00 E = 4.49	O = 11.00 E = 14.69	O = 15.00 E = 13.96	O = 6.00 E = 4.86
	Female	O = 4.00 E = 4.02	O = 9.00 E = 13.14	O = 17.00 E = 12.49	O = 4.00 E = 4.35
User	Male	O = 6.00 E = 5.32	O = 21.00 E = 17.40	O = 12.00 E = 16.53	O = 6.00 E = 5.75
	Female	O = 6.00 E = 5.91	O = 23.00 E = 19.33	O = 13.00 E = 18.37	O = 8.00 E = 6.39
Non User	Male	O = 6.00 E = 5.44	O = 19.00 E = 17.78	O = 17.00 E = 16.90	O = 4.00 E = 5.88
	Female	O = 3.00 E = 5.20	O = 20.00 E = 17.01	O = 17.00 E = 16.17	O = 4.00 E = 5.62

Chi Square = 16.5692 for 21 d.f.
NS

Again, it can be observed that relatively fewer of the male hippies report coming from "upper" social status backgrounds, while a relatively greater proportion than would be expected of female hippies and of users report the opposite. Interestingly, this phenomenon disappears in terms of estimates of current parental social standing, i.e., there is no difference between expected and observed frequencies of report. Over all, only one-eighth of the sample come from lower-middle class or lower class backgrounds.

In Tables 11c and 11d below are presented the number of years of education of the respondents' mothers and fathers.

Table 11c. Mother's Educational Background.

		Grade School	Junior High School	Some High School	High School	Some College	College Grad	Some Grad School	Completed Grad School	Don't Know
H	M	1 2%	2 4%	7 14%	15 30%	13 26%	4 8%	1 2%	2 4%	5 10%
	F	1 2%	1 2%	3 6%	18 36%	14 28%	8 16%	1 2%	4 8%	0 0%
W	M	4 8%	1 2%	3 6%	13 26%	13 26%	7 14%	4 8%	2 4%	3 6%
	F	2 4%	1 2%	4 8%	13 26%	17 34%	9 18%	3 6%	0 0%	1 2%
U	M	3 6%	2 4%	5 10%	14 28%	11 22%	4 8%	5 10%	6 12%	0 0%
	F	1 2%	1 2%	3 6%	14 28%	15 30%	7 14%	5 10%	4 8%	0 0%
NU	M	1 2%	0 0%	9 18%	10 20%	12 24%	8 16%	1 2%	7 14%	2 4%
	F	4 8%	1 2%	4 8%	17 34%	12 24%	5 10%	1 2%	6 12%	0 0%
Totals		17 4%	9 2%	38 10%	114 29%	107 27%	52 13%	21 5%	31 8%	11 3%

Table 11d. Father's Educational Background.

		Grade School	Junior High School	Some High School	High School	Some College	College Grad	Some Grad School	Completed Grad School	Don't Know
H	M	9 18%	1 2%	4 8%	12 24%	8 16%	6 12%	3 6%	3 6%	4 8%
	F	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	13 26%	10 20%	12 24%	3 6%	7 14%	1 2%
W	M	3 6%	4 8%	6 12%	9 18%	10 20%	10 20%	1 2%	5 10%	2 4%
	F	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%	14 28%	7 14%	11 22%	3 6%	9 18%	2 4%
U	M	1 2%	4 8%	3 6%	9 18%	9 18%	10 20%	3 6%	10 20%	1 2%
	F	2 4%	1 2%	4 8%	4 8%	13 26%	11 22%	2 4%	11 22%	2 4%
NU	M	2 4%	1 2%	6 12%	9 18%	10 20%	9 18%	4 8%	4 8%	5 10%
	F	4 8%	1 2%	1 2%	11 22%	12 24%	10 20%	3 6%	6 12%	2 4%
Totals		23 6%	13 3%	29 7%	81 20%	79 20%	79 20%	22 6%	55 14%	19 5%

No statistical analyses were performed on the parental education data, shown in Tables 11c and 11d, as many of the cells contain insufficient Ns for Chi Square analysis. However, it is interesting to make note of several trends in the data. First, the mothers have generally received slightly fewer years of education than have the fathers. Second, almost one-fifth of the fathers of the male hippies terminated their education at the grade school level - a far higher proportion than is found in any other group. Aside from this difference, however, all other groups report highly similar patterns of paternal education, barring some slight tendency for the users' fathers to be better educated, as are those of the female hippies and weekenders. Bearing in mind the fairly similar educational levels and the significantly different SES characteristics, using an SES scale determined by occupation and education, it would seem that occupational differences are of paramount importance in explaining differences in SES.

Data pertaining to the educational status of study participants is presented below in Tables 11e, f, and g. There are several a vantage points from which the data pertaining to the educational level of subjects can be described. In these tables are presented the number of dropouts below age 18, the number of those who are still full-time students, and the number of those over 18 who have terminated their full-time education.

Table 11e. Number of School Dropouts Among Study Participants (18 Years of Age and Younger, Who No Longer Are in School), and Grade Level at Which They Dropped Out.

		Total	Grade School	Junior High School	Some High School	High School	Some College
H	M	3	0	1	0	2	0
	F	5	0	0	2	3	0
W	M	6	0	0	2	2	2
	F	12	0	1	5	2	4
U	M	0	0	0	0	0	0
	F	0	0	0	0	0	0
NU	M	1	0	0	0	1	0
	F	1	0	0	0	1	0

Table 11f. Number of Subjects Currently in School Full-time According to Last Level Completed.

		Total	Last Level Completed							
			Grade School	Junior High School	Some High School	High School	Some College	College Grad	Some Grad School	Completed Grad School
H	M	8	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0
	F	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
W	M	10	0	0	0	1	5	1	3	0
	F	17	0	0	5	1	9	0	2	0
U	M	27	0	1	4	2	15	1	4	0
	F	22	0	1	7	3	10	1	0	0
NU	M	31	0	4	8	4	12	0	3	0
	F	29	0	2	11	7	8	1	0	0

Table 11g. Number of Part-time and/or Terminated Students Over 18 Years of Age, According to Last Level Completed.

		Total	Last Level Completed							
			Grade School	Junior High School	Some High School	High School	Some College	College Grad	Some Grad School	Completed Grad School
H	M	39	0	0	4	4	17	8	4	2
	F	41	0	2	4	3	21	6	2	3
W	M	34	0	0	3	8	19	1	3	0
	F	20	0	0	1	4	11	4	0	0
U	M	23	0	0	0	3	4	7	7	2
	F	27	0	0	1	3	6	11	4	2
NU	M	17	0	1	0	1	3	7	3	2
	F	20	0	0	0	2	7	4	4	3

First, with regard to the number of dropouts under 18, it will be noted that the female weekenders and, to a lesser extent, the female hippies, are over-represented in this category. In the aggregate, far more of the hippies and weekenders have dropped out than have either the users or the non users. Most dropped out either in senior high school or in the first year of college. It is interesting to make note of the fact that it is the weekender females who are most highly represented in the dropout category.

Turning now to a consideration of those who are currently in school full-time, it is to be noted, as might be expected from previous data, that a far greater proportion of the users and non users than the weekenders and hippies are still students (despite the fact that the groups were matched for age). As may be seen, almost all educational levels are represented, particularly among the users and the non users. As will be noted, the modal response in each of the groups indicates that the most common situation is that of the student still attending college.

Finally, among those subjects who, although over 18, have either terminated their education or who are attending school on a part-time basis, it will be noted that there is a tendency for more of the hippies and weekenders to be represented in this category than is the case among either users or non users. However, this is not to say that they necessarily terminated at a low educational level: the weekenders and hippies most generally terminated their education only after at least some attendance at college. Moreover, only a very slightly smaller proportion of hippies and weekenders than users and non users have completed some graduate school.

Subjects were queried regarding their religious preference, and the frequency with which they go to church or temple. Responses are categorized in terms of alignment with a recognized religion, and attendance at church or temple. The results of the analyses on this data are presented below, in Tables 12 and 13.

Table 12a. Reported Religious Affiliation Among All Groups.

		Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Agnostic	Atheist	No Preference	Eastern Mystical	Other
H	M	0 0%	1 2%	4 8%	4 8%	10 20%	17 34%	9 18%	5 10%
	F	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	5 10%	11 22%	15 30%	7 14%	8 16%
W	M	2 4%	3 6%	1 2%	4 8%	7 14%	20 40%	7 14%	4 8%
	F	1 2%	2 4%	6 12%	3 6%	6 12%	29 58%	2 4%	1 2%
U	M	2 4%	4 8%	11 22%	9 18%	3 6%	9 18%	3 6%	8 16%
	F	1 2%	3 6%	16 32%	12 24%	2 4%	10 20%	2 4%	2 4%
NU	M	4 8%	8 16%	22 44%	8 16%	3 6%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	6 12%	10 20%	23 46%	4 8%	1 2%	5 10%	0 0%	1 2%
Totals		17 4%	32 8%	85 21%	49 12%	43 11%	109 27%	30 8%	30 8%

Table 12b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 12a.

		Some Organized Religion	No Religion Reported
H	M	O = 9.00 E = 17.25	O = 41.00 E = 32.75
	F	O = 4.00 E = 17.25	O = 46.00 E = 32.75
W	M	O = 6.00 E = 17.25	O = 44.00 E = 32.75
	F	O = 9.00 E = 17.25	O = 41.00 E = 32.75
U	M	O = 17.00 E = 17.25	O = 33.00 E = 32.75
	F	O = 20.00 E = 17.25	O = 30.00 E = 32.75
NU	M	O = 34.00 E = 17.25	O = 16.00 E = 32.75
	F	O = 39.00 E = 17.25	O = 11.00 E = 32.75

Chi Square = 106.1622 for 7 d.f.
$p < .01$

As is suggested by the highly significant Chi Square shown in Table 12b, while the number of non-hippie users does not depart radically from the number one would expect to belong to an organized religion, far fewer of the hippies, both residents and weekenders, than one would expect report such allegiance, while a far greater frequency than one would expect of the non users report subscribing to one of the organized religious groups, i.e., Protestant, Catholic or Jewish. In other words, the non users tend to be more religious than do any of the other subjects. The hippie groups tend to be far less religious than do the non hippies. The users fall somewhere in between.

Approximately the same pattern of relationships is shown below, in Tables 13a and 13b.

Table 13a. Reported Attendance or Non Attendance at Religious Services, Among Groups.

		Every Day	Every Week	Every Week & Holidays	Some Weeks & Holidays	Holidays Only	Family Occasions	Never	Other
H	M	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	5 10%	35 70%	4 8%
	F	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	43 86%	4 8%
W	M	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	43 86%	2 4%
	F	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%	1 2%	3 6%	39 78%	3 6%
U	M	0 0%	4 8%	1 2%	3 6%	9 18%	5 10%	24 48%	4 8%
	F	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	3 6%	10 20%	8 16%	21 42%	6 12%
NU	M	0 0%	3 6%	6 12%	8 16%	9 18%	11 22%	12 24%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	2 4%	6 12%	11 22%	11 22%	11 22%	7 14%	2 4%
Totals		1 0%	12 3%	17 4%	30 8%	44 11%	44 11%	224 56%	26 7%

Table 13b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 13a.

		Go*	Do Not Go
H	M	O = 15.00 E = 21.05	O = 35.00 E = 28.95
	F	O = 7.00 E = 21.05	O = 43.00 E = 28.95
W	M	O = 7.00 E = 21.05	O = 43.00 E = 28.95
	F	O = 11.00 E = 21.05	O = 39.00 E = 28.95
U	M	O = 26.00 E = 21.05	O = 24.00 E = 28.95
	F	O = 29.00 E = 21.05	O = 21.00 E = 28.95
NU	M	O = 38.00 E = 21.05	O = 12.00 E = 28.95
	F	O = 43.00 E = 21.05	O = 7.00 E = 28.95

Chi Square = 122.1803 for 7 d.f.
p<.01

As in the preceding instance, the hippies are far less apt to attend church or temple services than are the other groups. Interestingly, both the non-hippie non users and users report religious service attendance more than would be expected. on the basis of chance distribution. In examining the data it would seem that, among the users, this is due to their attending during holy days, family occasions, etc.

In order to learn the nature of subjects' religious backgrounds, they were asked the religion of their mothers and fathers. Responses to this are shown below, in Tables 14a and 14 b.

*In order to obtain the observed frequency in the "Go" column the numbers in the "Do Not Go" column were subtracted from the total N in each cell.

Table 14a. Reported Religious Affiliation of Respondents' Mothers, Among All Groups.

		Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Agnostic	Atheist	No Preference	Eastern Mystical	Other
H	M	10 20%	12 24%	18 36%	3 6%	2 4%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%
	F	14 28%	7 14%	18 36%	4 8%	2 4%	4 8%	1 2%	0 0%
W	M	12 24%	13 26%	15 30%	4 8%	3 6%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	12 24%	7 14%	24 48%	1 2%	2 4%	3 6%	0 0%	1 2%
U	M	9 18	8 16%	27 54%	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	5 10%	9 18%	31 62%	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
NU	M	4 8%	11 22%	31 62%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	5 10%	12 24%	32 64%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
Totals		71 18%	79 20%	196 49%	19 5%	12 3%	16 4%	2 1%	3 1%

Table 14b. Reported Religious Affiliation of Respondents' Fathers, Among All Groups.

		Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Agnostic	Atheist	No Preference	Eastern Mystical	Other
H	M	4 8%	10 20%	18 36%	2 4%	6 12%	8 16%	2 4%	0 0%
	F	9 18%	8 16%	21 42%	3 6%	4 8%	5 10%	0 0%	0 0%
W	M	10 20%	11 22%	17 34%	4 8%	3 6%	4 8%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	10 20%	7 14%	23 46%	1 2%	2 4%	6 12%	0 0%	1 2%
U	M	8 16%	8 16%	27 54%	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	2 4%
	F	3 6%	11 22%	30 60%	3 6%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
NU	M	4 8%	11 22%	31 62%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	6 12%	7 14%	31 62%	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%
Totals		54 14%	73 18%	198 50%	18 5%	19 5%	29 7%	3 1%	4 1%

It is interesting to note at this point that religious affiliation among Jews drops markedly between generations. That is, even among the non-user group , which includes the greatest relative proportion of those still reporting religious affiliation, parental Jewish affiliation is reported by over 60%, whereas subjects themselves have dropped to an average of 45%. The difference among other study groups is even more marked. Among other denominations, however, the trend is not nearly so marked.

Chi Square analyses were not performed on parental religious affiliation data due to the sampling error involved, i.e., the user and non-user samples were drawn primarily from Jewish Community Centers - thus biasing that portion of the sample in terms of religious background. The truly startling fact, which is not shown by the Chi Square analysis, is that in a city which is approximately 19% Jewish, approximately 40% of all hippies and weekenders are of Jewish origin. This is interesting, moreover, in that one generally associates Jewish background with academic and vocational striving, and not "dropping out."

A comparison also was made among groups in terms of whether or not parents are of differing religions. The results of this comparison are shown below in Table 15.

Table 15. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Religiously Mixed Marriage Data.

		Mixed	Not Mixed
H	M	O = 20.00 E = 8.25	O = 30.00 E = 41.75
	F	O = 12.00 E = 8.25	O = 38.00 E = 41.75
W	M	O = 7.00 E = 8.25	O = 43.00 E = 41.75
	F	O = 5.00 E = 8.25	O = 45.00 E = 41.75
U	M	O = 3.00 E = 8.25	O = 47.00 E = 41.75
	F	O = 6.00 E = 8.25	O = 44.00 E = 41.75
NU	M	O = 5.00 E = 8.25	O = 45.00 E = 41.75
	F	O = 8.00 E = 8.25	O = 42.00 E = 41.75

Chi Square = 30.1216 for 7 d.f.
$p < .01$

With regard to Table 15 it appears that a highly disproportionate number of hippies come from mixed religious backgrounds. The hippies appear to account almost totally for the highly significant Chi Square value. It would seem that this constitutes yet another form of stress which, as data immediately following suggest, is associated with being a hippie.

Turning now from religious to political orientation, presented below, in Table 16, are data descriptive of the respondents' political beliefs, the political beliefs of their fathers, of their mothers and of their friends. Due to the highly skewed distribution, resulting in a number of cell entries of 1, no Chi Square analyses were attempted.

Table 16a. Respondents' Reports of Own Political Beliefs.

		Radical	New Left	Liberal	Middle of Road	Moderately Conservative	Strongly Conservative	None	Other
H	M	22 44%	9 18%	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	7 14%	3 6%
	F	24 48%	8 16%	4 8%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	9 18%	3 6%
W	M	21 42%	14 28%	7 14%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	5 10%	1 2%
	F	19 38%	14 28%	6 12%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	8 16%	1 2%
U	M	10 20%	10 20%	13 26%	6 12%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	8 16%
	F	9 18%	11 22%	17 34%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%	5 10%	3 6%
NU	M	1 2%	2 4%	15 30%	11 22%	10 20%	3 6%	5 10%	2 4%
	F	2 4%	4 8%	17 34%	13 26%	5 10%	2 4%	3 6%	4 8%
Totals		108 27%	72 18%	82 21%	35 9%	17 4%	11 3%	43 11%	25 6%

Table 16b. Respondents' Reports of Father's Political Beliefs.

		Not Applicable	Radical	New Left	Liberal	Middle of Road	Moderately Cons.	Strongly Cons.	None	Other	Don't Know
H	M	2 4%	3 6%	3 6%	11 22%	8 16%	8 16%	6 12%	4 8%	0 0%	2 4%
	F	0 0%	5 10%	0 0%	13 26%	11 22%	9 18%	5 10%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%
W	M	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%	16 32%	10 20%	7 14%	6 12%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	4 8%	5 10%	3 6%	13 26%	11 22%	5 10%	3 6%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%
U	M	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	18 36%	11 22%	11 22%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%
	F	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	16 32%	10 20%	10 20%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%
NU	M	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	10 20%	10 20%	16 32%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	2 4%
	F	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	10 20%	15 30%	9 18%	3 6%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%
Totals		8 2%	18 5%	9 2%	107 27%	86 22%	75 19%	30 8%	12 3%	8 2%	7 2%

Table 16c. Respondents' Reports of Mother's Political Beliefs.

		Not Applicable	Radical	New Left	Liberal	Middle of Road	Moderately Cons.	Strongly Cons.	None	Other	Don't Know
H	M	1 2%	1 2%	4 8%	17 34%	4 8%	6 12%	3 6%	8 16%	1 2%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	6 12%	1 2%	12 24%	12 24%	7 14%	2 4%	6 12%	1 2%	0 0%
W	M	3 6%	2 4%	2 4%	18 36%	9 18%	1 2%	5 10%	6 12%	2 4%	0 0%
	F	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%	16 32%	12 24%	5 10%	5 10%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%
U	M	3 6%	0 0%	2 4%	16 32%	15 30%	5 10%	0 0%	4 8%	2 4%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	2 4%	1 2%	18 36%	9 18%	10 20%	3 6%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%
NU	M	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	11 22%	15 30%	8 16%	2 4%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	11 22%	15 30%	11 22%	2 4%	2 4%	2 4%	0 0%
Totals		9 2%	14 4%	12 3%	119 30%	91 23%	53 13%	22 6%	35 9%	10 3%	3 1%

Table 16d. Respondents' Reports of Political Beliefs of Very Close Friends.

		Not Applicable	Radical	New Left	Liberal	Middle of Road	Moderately Cons.	Strongly Cons.	None	Other	Don't Know
H	M	1 2%	22 44%	11 22%	8 16%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3 6%	1 2%	4 8%
	F	3 6%	25 50%	9 18%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%	1 2%	5 10%
W	M	2 4%	18 36%	16 32%	3 6%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%	4 8%	1 2%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	23 46%	16 32%	2 4%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%
U	M	6 12%	3 6%	14 28%	13 26%	6 12%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%	3 6%	1 2%
	F	1 2%	12 24%	9 18%	17 34%	2 4%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%
NU	M	0 0%	3 6%	4 8%	18 36%	10 20%	7 14%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%
	F	2 4%	3 6%	5 10%	21 42%	8 16%	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	5 10%	1 2%
Totals		15 4%	109 27%	84 21%	84 21%	30 8%	15 4%	2 1%	16 4%	15 4%	14 4%

As was expected, it appears that the political beliefs of the hippies, the weekenders and the users are to the "left" of the non users. On the other hand, the degree of difference which had been expected between the parents of the hippies, weekenders and users, and those of the non users simply failed to materialize. This could suggest that the relatively small numbers of mothers and fathers classified as members of the "radical left" and "new left" by their hippie and user children represent some degree of distortion of perception. What is remarkable here is the very uniform distribution of responses reporting parents as liberal, "middle of the road," moderately conservative, or for that matter, strongly conservative. Previous studies have suggested that today's radical youth come from the more politically left families; it would seem that insofar as our sample is concerned, this simply is not the case. As might be expected, among the "more left" subjects the political beliefs of friends are themselves more left. It should be noted, however, that although the non users fall to the "right" of all other groups, they themselves are hardly conservative i.e., of all non users, two-thirds consider themselves middle of the road or left of middle of the road, with only one-fifth indicating political beliefs which are moderately or strongly conservative.

In discussing further the nature of the background of our subjects, the next area of interest is the reported marital happiness of their parents, both during respondents' childhood and currently. These data are presented below in Tables 17 and 18, respectively.

Table 17a. Reported Marital Happiness of Subject's Parents During Subject's Childhood.

		Very Happy	Happy	Average	Unhappy	Very Unhappy	One/Both Parents Dead
H	M	7 14%	9 18%	14 28%	12 24%	7 14%	1 2%
	F	8 16%	10 20%	14 28%	6 12%	11 22%	1 2%
W	M	4 8%	12 24%	22 44%	7 14%	4 8%	0 0%
	F	5 10%	12 24%	19 38%	8 16%	4 8%	2 4%
U	M	12 24%	15 30%	13 26%	7 14%	2 4%	1 2%
	F	18 35%	15 29%	11 22%	4 8%	2 4%	1 2%
NU	M	7 14%	23 46%	16 32%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%
	F	20 41%	13 27%	8 16%	3 6%	4 8%	0 0%
Totals		81 20%	109 27%	117 29%	50 13%	35 9%	6 2%

Table 17b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 17a.

		Very Happy	Happy	Average	Unhappy or Very Unhappy
H	M	O = 7.00 E = 10.12	O = 9.00 E = 13.62	O = 14.00 E = 14.62	O = 19.00 E = 10.62
	F	O = 8.00 E = 10.12	O = 10.00 E = 13.62	O = 14.00 E = 14.62	O = 17.00 E = 10.62
W	M	O = 4.00 E = 10.12	O = 12.00 E = 13.62	O = 22.00 E = 14.62	O = 11.00 E = 10.62
	F	O = 5.00 E = 9.92	O = 12.00 E = 13.35	O = 19.00 E = 14.33	O = 12.00 E = 10.41
U	M	O = 12.00 E = 10.12	O = 15.00 E = 13.62	O = 13.00 E = 14.62	O = 9.00 E = 10.62
	F	O = 18.00 E = 10.33	O = 15.00 E = 13.90	O = 11.00 E = 14.92	O = 6.00 E = 10.84
NU	M	O = 7.00 E = 10.33	O = 23.00 E = 13.90	O = 16.00 E = 14.92	O = 4.00 E = 10.84
	F	O = 20.00 E = 9.92	O = 13.00 E = 13.35	O = 8.00 E = 14.33	O = 7.00 E = 10.41

Chi Square = 61.8742 for 21 d.f.
$p < .01$

Table 18a. Reported Current Marital Happiness of Subjects' Parents.

		Very Happy	Happy	Average	Unhappy	Very Unhappy	One/Both Parents Dead
H	M	3 6%	5 10%	4 8%	9 18%	1 2%	5 10%
	F	4 8%	4 8%	13 26%	2 4%	2 4%	5 10%
W	M	1 2%	7 14%	9 18%	7 14%	4 8%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	9 18%	13 26%	3 6%	1 2%	3 6%
U	M	6 12%	15 30%	10 20%	3 6%	1 2%	10 20%
	F	13 26%	13 26%	12 24%	6 12%	2 4%	3 6%
NU	M	10 20%	18 36%	13 26%	2 4%	1 2%	5 10%
	F	15 31%	12 25%	5 10%	2 4%	2 4%	6 12%
Totals		52 13%	83 21%	79 20%	34 9%	14 4%	38 10%

Table 18b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 18a.

		Happy or Very Happy	Average	Unhappy or Very Unhappy
H	M	O = 8.00 E = 11.34	O = 4.00 E = 6.63	O = 10.00 E = 4.03
	F	O = 8.00 E = 12.88	O = 13.00 E = 7.54	O = 4.00 E = 4.58
W	M	O = 8.00 E = 14.43	O = 9.00 E = 8.44	O = 11.00 E = 5.13
	F	O = 9.00 E = 13.40	O = 13.00 E = 7.84	O = 4.00 E = 4.76
U	M	O = 21.00 E = 18.03	O = 10.00 E = 10.55	O = 4.00 E = 6.41
	F	O = 26.00 E = 23.70	O = 12.00 E = 13.87	O = 8.00 E = 8.43
NU	M	O = 28.00 E = 22.67	O = 13.00 E = 13.27	O = 3.00 E = 8.06
	F	O = 27.00 E = 18.55	O = 5.00 E = 10.85	O = 4.00 E = 6.60

Chi Square = 45.7141 for 14 d.f.
p<.01

One can see in Tables 17 and 18 that the departures from expected frequencies are highly significant. This is occasioned in both instances by a disproportionately great number of hippies and weekenders reporting marital unhappiness or "average" happiness between their parents, both currently and during their childhood. Conversely, users and non users judge their parents' marriages as happy or extremely happy far more frequently. It is interesting here to note again the extreme response by the female hippies: 22% of this group report their parents' relationship as "very unhappy" during the subjects' childhood. Strikingly, this drops to four percent when they evaluate the current state of parental happiness. In view of the relatively small number of subjects involved, it is impossible to ascertain if this change in relative frequencies is due to a perceived resurgence of marital bliss between parents; if it is a function of the disproportionately great number of family breakups reported on later in this section, i.e., whether new parental unions are happier than were the old; or if subjects were cynically labelling "happy" what they perceived as a now well-established, miserable symbiosis. The same phenomenon is reflected in the data presented in Table 19 below, in which 22% of the hippie females report very frequent serious arguments among their parents during childhood.

Along the same general lines, a disproportionate number of male hippies and weekenders also report "very frequent" and "frequent" "serious arguments" between their parents during their childhood. In looking at the data on the users and the non users, it is apparent that they are under-represented in the "very frequent" and "frequent" categories, and that, in fact, they tend to report that serious arguments happen either "rarely" or "never."

Table 19a. Reported Frequency of Serious Arguments Between Parents During Subject's Childhood.

		Very Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely or Never
H	M	4 8%	6 12%	20 40%	15 30%
	F	11 22%	7 14%	12 24%	17 34%
W	M	3 6%	8 16%	23 46%	14 28%
	F	8 16%	3 6%	16 32%	22 44%
U	M	1 2%	1 2%	21 42%	26 52%
	F	3 6%	4 8%	17 33%	27 53%
NU	M	1 2%	5 10%	13 26%	29 58%
	F	3 6%	5 10%	14 29%	27 55%
Totals		34 9%	39 10%	136 34%	177 44%

Table 19b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 19a.

		Frequently or Very Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely or Never
H	M	O = 10.00 E = 8.51	O = 20.00 E = 15.85	O = 15.00 E = 20.63
	F	O = 18.00 E = 8.89	O = 12.00 E = 16.56	O = 17.00 E = 21.55
W	M	O = 11.00 E = 9.08	O = 23.00 E = 16.91	O = 14.00 E = 22.01
	F	O = 11.00 E = 9.27	O = 16.00 E = 17.26	O = 22.00 E = 22.47
U	M	O = 2.00 E = 9.27	O = 21.00 E = 17.26	O = 26.00 E = 22.47
	F	O = 7.00 E = 9.65	O = 17.00 E = 17.97	O = 27.00 E = 23.39
NU	M	O = 6.00 E = 9.08	O = 13.00 E = 16.91	O = 29.00 E = 22.01
	F	O = 8.00 E = 9.27	O = 14.00 E = 17.26	O = 27.00 E = 22.47

Chi Square = 34.6502 for 14 d.f.
p<.01

Precisely the same general pattern is manifested regarding the evaluation of family "closeness" during the subject's childhood, presented in Table 20 below.

Table 20a. Reported Family"Closeness" During Subject's Childhood.

		Very Close	Very Close But Often Bickering	Close Warm	Fairly Close	Indifferent Cool	Unhappy Bickering	Disturbed Hostile
H	M	9 18%	1 2%	12 24%	14 28%	9 18%	1 2%	4 8%
	F	3 6%	4 8%	14 28%	8 16%	5 10%	9 18%	7 14%
W	M	2 4%	9 18%	10 20%	17 34%	5 10%	0 0%	6 12%
	F	5 10%	8 16%	10 20%	16 32%	3 6%	4 8%	3 6%
U	M	9 18%	6 12%	14 28%	14 28%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%
	F	8 16%	8 16%	13 26%	11 22%	3 6%	5 10%	1 2%
NU	M	10 20%	10 20%	16 32%	9 18%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	9 18%	17 34%	15 30%	2 4%	2 4%	3 6%	0 0%
Totals		55 14%	63 16%	104 26%	91 23%	34 9%	23 6%	22 6%

Table 20b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 20a.

		Close or Very Close	Close, Fairly Close	Indifferent Unhappy Hostile
H	M	O = 10.00 E = 15.05	O = 26.00 E = 24.87	O = 14.00 E = 10.08
	F	O = 7.00 E = 15.05	O = 22.00 E = 24.87	O = 21.00 E = 10.08
W	M	O = 11.00 E = 14.75	O = 27.00 E = 24.37	O = 11.00 E = 9.87
	F	O = 13.00 E = 14.75	O = 26.00 E = 24.37	O = 10.00 E = 9.87
U	M	O = 15.00 E = 14.15	O = 28.00 E = 23.38	O = 4.00 E = 9.47
	F	O = 16.00 E = 14.75	O = 24.00 E = 24.37	O = 9.00 E = 9.87
NU	M	O = 20.00 E = 15.05	O - 25.00 E = 24.87	O = 5.00 E = 10.08
	F	O = 26.00 E = 14.45	O = 17.00 E = 23.88	O = 5.00 E = 9.67

Chi Square = 43.4088 for 14 d.f.
p<.01

As Table 20 shows, far fewer of the hippie groups report extremely warm, close families than do representatives of the non-hippie group. Rather, the hippies are over-represented in their reporting of indifferent, unhappy and hostile family situations in childhood. It should be noted that this is particularly the case among the female hippies. The non-hippie groups are under-represented in the indifferent, unhappy and hostile family category. There is not discernable difference, however, between the users and the non users in terms of this dimension.

Information was collected from the subjects as to whether their families of origin are broken or intact. Specifically, they were asked to indicate whether their parents are still married and living together, or whether they are divorced, separated, or widowed. Inspection of Table 21 below reveals a far greater proportion of the hippies and of the male weekenders than would be expected as having come from broken homes. Again, we see the rather dramatic frequency of disruption reported by the female hippies, over half of whom come from broken homes.

Table 21a. Reported Prevalence of Broken Families, According to Group.

		Separated	Divorced	Father Widower	Mother Widow	Both Deceased	Mother Remarried	Father Remarried	Total
H	M	2 4%	6 12%	1 2%	6 12%	3 6%	2 4%	3 6%	23 46%
	F	12 24%	7 14%	3 6%	3 6%	1 2%	2 4%	2 4%	30 60%
W	M	6 12%	6 12%	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%	2 4%	1 2%	19 38%
	F	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%	2 4%	1 2%	9 18%
U	M	2 4%	1 2%	4 8%	4 8%	1 2%	1 2%	4 8%	17 34%
	F	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%	3 6%	0 0%	2 4%	2 4%	9 18%
NU	M	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%	4 8%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	9 18%
	F	2 4%	5 10%	5 10%	5 10%	1 2%	3 6%	5 10%	26 52%

Table 21b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 21a.

		Broken	Intact
H	M	O = 18.00 E = 13.62	O = 32.00 E = 36.37
	F	O = 26.00 E = 13.62	O = 24.00 E = 36.37
W	M	O = 16.00 E = 13.62	O = 34.00 E = 36.37
	F	O = 6.00 E = 13.62	O = 44.00 E = 36.37
U	M	O = 12.00 E = 13.62	O = 38.00 E = 36.37
	F	O = 5.00 E = 13.62	O = 45.00 E = 36.37
NU	M	O = 8.00 E = 13.62	O = 42.00 E = 36.37
	F	O = 18.00 E = 13.62	O = 32.00 E = 36.37

Chi Square = 36.7099 for 7 d.f.
$p < .01$

Table 21b reveals that it is the weekender females who exhibit a less-than-expected prevalence of broken homes among the hippie groups. It is also interesting to note that among the non users, more females than would be expected report having come from broken homes. Clearly, this is not a straight-line relationship; it would be most interesting to examine this variable in relation to a large population, so as to obviate the possibility of any sampling error. In general, it would seem that one of the factors which discriminates between hippies and non hippies is that of broken family background.

Bearing in mind the rather surprising differences between males and females along the dimension of parental family breakdown, a further analysis was done between males and females in this respect. The results of this analysis, i.e., comparing males and females in terms of frequency of reported parental family breakdowns, were totally non-significant. (Chi Square = .0126 for one d.f.)

The subjects were asked whether they felt their parents individually had achieved their goals in various areas: education, status, and character. The results of these analyses are presented below in Tables 22 through 24.

Table 22a. Reported Realization of Educational Goals: Father and Mother

		Father/Mother									
		Yes/Yes	Yes/No	Yes/ Don't Know	No/Yes	No/No	No/ Don't Know	Don't Know/ Yes	Don't Know/ No	Don't Know/ Don't Know	Does Not Answer
H	M	9 18%	4 8%	3 6%	8 16%	11 22%	1 2%	2 4%	4 8%	7 14%	1 2%
	F	11 22%	10 20%	2 4%	6 12%	16 32%	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%
W	M	15 30%	4 8%	4 8%	7 14%	10 20%	2 4%	2 4%	2 4%	4 8%	0 0%
	F	15 30%	9 18%	0 0%	3 6%	11 22%	4 8%	2 4%	2 4%	4 8%	0 0%
U	M	11 22%	8 16%	5 10%	7 14%	11 22%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%	2 4%	2 4%
	F	15 30%	13 26%	2 4%	5 10%	11 22%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%
NU	M	17 34%	6 12%	1 2%	6 12%	10 20%	3 6%	2 4%	1 2%	3 6%	1 2%
	F	15 30%	12 24%	3 6%	6 12%	8 16%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%
Totals		108 27%	66 17%	20 5%	48 12%	88 22%	17 4%	11 3%	13 3%	24 6%	5 1%

Table 22b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 22a: Mother

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 19.00 E = 19.00	O = 19.00 E = 19.00
	F	O = 17.00 E = 21.50	O = 26.00 E = 21.50
W	M	O = 24.00 E = 20.00	O = 16.00 E = 20.00
	F	O = 20.00 E = 21.00	O = 22.00 E = 21.00
U	M	O = 18.00 E = 19.50	O = 21.00 E = 19.50
	F	O = 22.00 E = 23.00	O = 24.00 E = 23.00
NU	M	O = 25.00 E = 21.00	O = 17.00 E = 21.00
	F	O = 22.00 E = 22.00	O = 22.00 E = 22.00

Chi Square = 5.4205 for 7 d.f.
NS

Table 22c. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 22a: Father.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 16.00 E = 20.13	O = 20.00 E = 15.87
	F	O = 23.00 E = 26.84	O = 25.00 E = 21.16
W	M	O = 23.00 E = 23.48	O = 19.00 E = 18.52
	F	O = 24.00 E = 23.48	O = 18.00 E = 18.52
U	M	O = 24.00 E = 24.60	O = 20.00 E = 19.40
	F	O = 30.00 E = 26.28	O = 17.00 E = 20.72
NU	M	O = 24.00 E = 24.04	O = 19.00 E = 18.96
	F	O = 30.00 E = 25.16	O = 15.00 E = 19.84

Chi Square = 6.5538 for 7 d.f.
NS

Table 23a. Reported Realization of Status Goals: Father and Mother

		Father/Mother									
		Yes/Yes	Yes/No	Yes/ Don't Know	No/Yes	No/No	No/ Don't Know	Don't Know/ Yes	Don't Know/ No	Don't Know/ Don't Know	Does Not Answer
H	M	7 14%	2 4%	1 2%	6 12%	11 22%	7 14%	3 6%	0 0%	10 20%	3 6%
	F	10 20%	8 16%	6 12%	3 6%	11 22%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	8 16%	2 4%
W	M	13 26%	4 8%	1 2%	4 8%	11 22%	6 12%	3 6%	0 0%	8 16%	0 0%
	F	14 28%	7 14%	2 4%	1 2%	14 28%	2 4%	2 4%	3 6%	5 10%	0 0%
U	M	20 40%	5 10%	3 6%	6 12%	6 12%	0 0%	1 2%	2 4%	5 10%	2 4%
	F	27 54%	5 10%	2 4%	2 4%	6 12%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	4 8%	0 0%
NU	M	20 40%	4 8%	5 10%	2 4%	6 12%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	8 16%	1 2%
	F	20 40%	2 4%	1 2%	4 8%	5 10%	2 4%	3 6%	3 6%	8 16%	2 4%
Totals		131 33%	37 9%	21 5%	28 7%	70 18%	20 5%	16 4%	10 3%	56 14%	10 3%

Table 23b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 23a: Mother.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 16.00 E = 17.38	O = 13.00 E = 11.62
	F	O = 14.00 E = 19.78	O = 19.00 E = 13.22
W	M	O = 20.00 E = 20.98	O = 15.00 E = 14.02
	F	O = 17.00 E = 24.57	O = 24.00 E = 16.43
U	M	O = 27.00 E = 23.97	O = 13.00 E = 16.03
	F	O = 31.00 E = 25.77	O = 12.00 E = 17.23
NU	M	O = 23.00 E = 20.38	O = 11.00 E = 13.62
	F	O = 27.00 E = 22.17	O = 10.00 E = 14.83

Chi Square = 17.4882 for 7 d.f.
p<.05

Table 23c. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 23a: Father.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 10.00 E = 21.02	O = 24.00 E = 12.98
	F	O = 24.00 E = 24.11	O = 15.00 E = 14.89
W	M	O = 18.00 E = 24.11	O = 21.00 E = 14.89
	F	O = 23.00 E = 24.72	O = 17.00 E = 15.28
U	M	O = 28.00 E = 24.72	O = 12.00 E = 15.28
	F	O = 34.00 E = 26.58	O = 9.00 E = 16.42
NU	M	O = 29.00 E = 23.49	O = 9.00 E = 14.51
	F	O = 25.00 E = 22.25	O = 11.00 E = 13.75

Chi Square = 30.3246 for 7 d.f.
p<.01

Table 24a. Reported Realization of Character Goals: Father and Mother

		Father/Mother									
		Yes/Yes	Yes/No	Yes/ Don't Know	No/Yes	No/No	No/ Don't Know	Don't Know/ Yes	Don'tKnow/ No	Don't Know/ Don't Know	Does Not Answer
H	M	16 32%	2 4%	2 4%	4 8%	6 12%	2 4%	5 10%	1 2%	11 22%	1 2%
	F	11 22%	4 8%	6 12%	5 10%	6 12%	1 2%	6 12%	1 2%	10 20%	0 0%
W	M	18 36%	4 8%	4 8%	7 14%	6 12%	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%	6 12%	1 2%
	F	19 38%	1 2%	3 6%	5 10%	9 18%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	8 16%	1 2%
U	M	26 52%	4 8%	5 10%	3 6%	2 4%	3 6%	0 0%	2 4%	3 6%	2 4%
	F	20 40%	3 6%	8 16%	2 4%	6 12%	0 0%	4 8%	3 6%	4 8%	0 0%
NU	M	29 58%	0 0%	5 10%	4 8%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	9 18%	1 2%
	F	33 66%	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%	5 10%	1 2%	5 10%	1 2%
Totals		172 43%	19 5%	33 8%	33 8%	36 9%	8 2%	25 6%	11 3%	56 14%	7 2%

Table 24b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 24a: Mother

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 25.00 E = 26.33	O = 9.00 E = 7.67
	F	O = 22.00 E = 25.56	O = 11.00 E = 7.44
W	M	O = 28.00 E = 29.43	O = 10.00 E = 8.57
	F	O = 26.00 E = 28.65	O = 11.00 E = 8.35
U	M	O = 29.00 E = 28.65	O = 8.00 E = 8.35
	F	O = 26.00 E = 29.43	O = 12.00 E = 8.57
NU	M	O = 33.00 E = 27.88	O = 3.00 E = 8.12
	F	O = 41.00 E = 34.07	O = 3.00 E = 9.93

Chi Square = 16.0856 for 7 d.f.
p<.05

Table 24c. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented in Table 24a: Father.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 20.00 E = 23.81	O = 12.00 E = 8.19
	F	O = 21.00 E = 24.56	O = 12.00 E = 8.44
W	M	O = 26.00 E = 29.77	O = 14.00 E = 10.23
	F	O = 23.00 E = 28.28	O = 15.00 E = 9.72
U	M	O = 35.00 E = 32.00	O = 8.00 E = 11.00
	F	O = 31.00 E = 29.02	O - 8.00 E = 9.98
NU	M	O = 34.00 E = 28.28	O = 4.00 E = 9.72
	F	O = 34.00 E = 28.28	O = 4.00 E = 9.72

Chi Square = 20.7935 for 7 d.f.
p<.01

As is indicated by the data presented in Table 22, there is no significant difference among the groups in terms of their perceptions of parental educational goal achievement. On the other hand, as can been seen from Tables 23 and 24, there are highly significant differences among groups, in terms of the proportion of subjects in each group who perceive their parents as achieving status and character goals.

With regard to the data in Table 23 regarding status goals, it is particularly interesting to note that it is the female weekenders and hippies who perceive their mothers as having fallen short of status goals; the effect is not nearly so marked among the males. Conversely, it is a disportionately great number of male hippies and weekenders who perceive their fathers as having fallen short of status goals which would appear to account for the significant effect; again, the effect is not nearly so marked among other groups, or among female hippies and weekenders.

This is an interesting finding, in that a central theme in the hippie critique of society is their disillusionment with what they perceive as an overemphasis on status. In light of this, it might be expected that the hippies and weekenders would generalize and would perceive both parents as having fallen short of status goals. Instead, they appear to discriminate between parents: males perceive their fathers, but not their mothers and females perceive their mothers, but not their fathers as having fallen short of status goals. This would suggest the possibility that the same sexed parent has conveyed a sense of failure which becomes integrated by his hippie offspring as a rejection of any emphasis on status. In this context, it is particularly interesting to see that the results presented in Table 24, with regard to "character," although highly significant, are completely generalized, i.e., there is no male-female differentiation, as is the case with status goals. This would appear to lend weight to the interpretation of the data on achievement of status goals.

As part of the section on personal and family background and history, subjects were questioned as to the smoking and drinking habits of themselves and their parents. First, they were asked whether they smoked cigarettes, and drank alcoholic beverages. Responses to these questions and analyses of these responses are presented below in Table 27 and Table 28, respectively.

Table 27a. Responses to Question: "Do you smoke cigarettes regularly (around 1/2 pack a day or more)?"

		Yes	No
H	M	27 54%	23 46%
	F	28 56%	21 42%
W	M	27 54%	21 42%
	F	24 48%	21 42%
U	M	14 28%	33 66%
	F	19 37%	31 61%
NU	M	6 12%	40 80%
	F	5 10%	38 78%
Totals		150 38%	228 57%

Table 27b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 27a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 27.00 E = 19.84	O = 23.00 E = 30.16
	F	O = 28.00 E = 19.44	O = 21.00 E = 29.56
W	M	O = 27.00 E = 19.05	O = 21.00 E = 28.95
	F	O = 24.00 E = 17.86	O = 21.00 E = 27.14
U	M	O = 14.00 E = 18.65	O = 33.00 E = 28.35
	F	O = 19.00 E = 19.84	O = 31.00 E = 30.16
NU	M	O = 6.00 E = 18.25	O = 40.00 E = 27.75
	F	O = 5.00 E = 17.06	O = 38.00 E = 25.94

Chi Square = 49.2904 for 7 d.f.
$p < .01$

Table 28a. Frequencies of Subjects Reporting Use of Alcoholic Beverages.

		Beer	Liquor	Beer & Liquor	Wine	Wine & Beer	Wine & Liquor	Wine Beer & Liquor	None
H	M	3 6%	3 6%	0 0%	6 12%	7 14%	2 4%	18 36%	10 20%
	F	0 0%	3 6%	0 0%	11 22%	4 8%	2 4%	13 26%	17 34%
W	M	5 10%	0 0%	1 2%	6 12%	10 20%	0 0%	14 28%	13 26%
	F	2 4%	4 8%	0 0%	7 14%	4 8%	1 2%	7 14%	25 50%
U	M	1 2%	2 4%	2 4%	5 10%	4 8%	4 8%	27 54%	4 8%
	F	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	9 18%	2 4%	7 14%	26 51%	4 8%
NU	M	4 8%	2 4%	3 6%	2 4%	4 8%	5 10%	25 50%	5 10%
	F	0 0%	0 0%	3 6%	0 0%	3 6%	13 27%	21 43%	9 18%
Totals		16 4%	15 4%	9 2%	46 12%	38 10%	34 9%	151 38%	87 22%

Table 28b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 28a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 40.00 E = 39.12	O = 10.00 E = 10.87
	F	O = 33.00 E = 39.12	O = 17.00 E = 10.87
W	M	O = 37.00 E = 39.12	O = 13.00 E = 10.87
	F	O = 25.00 E = 39.12	O = 25.00 E = 10.87
U	M	O = 46.00 E = 39.12	O = 4.00 E = 10.87
	F	O = 46.00 E = 39.12	O = 4.00 E = 10.87
NU	M	O = 45.00 E = 39.12	O = 5.00 E = 10.87
	F	O = 41.00 E = 39.12	O = 9.00 E = 10.87

Chi Square = 44.0527 for 7 d.f.
$p < .01$

From an inspection of Table 27 it appears that while more of the hippies and weekenders smoke than would be expected, the converse is true for the non-hippie groups. It is interesting to note that despite public awareness of the hazards of smoking, over one-third of all subjects report that they smoke regularly. With respect to drinking, although the hippie groups do tend to drink less, it would seem that the hippies are not as temperate as had been thought. That is, especially with regard to hard liquor, the public image has been that hippies reject this particular drug form in favor of the other more popularly stereotyped drugs. This seems not to be the case with our sample, although they do drink less than do their non-hippie peers.

No statistically significant differences in drinking behavior were found among parents of the four groups, in terms either of the variety or the amount of alcoholic substances consumed. As the data presented in Table 29 suggest, parental drinking patterns appear to fall within generally-accepted, normal limits.

Table 29a. Types of Alcoholic Beverages Reported Consumed by Mother.

		None	Beer	Liquor	Beer & Liquor	Wine	Wine & Beer	Wine & Liquor	Wine Beer & Liquor
H	M	10 20%	0 0%	4 8%	3 6%	2 4%	2 4%	11 22%	13 26%
	F	7 14%	0 0%	3 6%	1 2%	9 18%	0 0%	12 24%	18 36%
W	M	12 24%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	10 20%	1 2%	12 24%	11 22%
	F	7 14%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	14 28%	1 2%	9 18%	15 30%
U	M	5 10%	1 2%	3 6%	8 16%	3 6%	0 0%	18 36%	11 22%
	F	4 8%	1 2%	3 6%	2 4%	4 8%	0 0%	19 37%	18 35%
NU	M	3 6%	0 0%	2 4%	2 4%	7 14%	2 4%	15 30%	19 38%
	F	5 10%	1 2%	3 6%	2 4%	6 12%	2 4%	13 27%	17 35%
Totals		53 13%	5 1%	21 5%	21 5%	55 13%	8 2%	109 27%	122 31%

Table 29b. Types of Alcoholic Beverages Reported Consumed by Father.

		None	Beer	Liquor	Beer & Liquor	Wine	Wine & Beer	Wine & Liquor	Wine Beer & Liquor
H	M	7 14%	3 6%	4 8%	4 8%	1 2%	0 0%	5 10%	21 42%
	F	4 8%	1 2%	1 2%	4 8%	2 4%	5 10%	6 12%	27 54%
W	M	9 18%	1 2%	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%	6 12%	5 10%	26 52%
	F	6 12%	2 4%	2 4%	0 0%	8 16%	2 4%	2 4%	28 56%
U	M	3 6%	2 4%	2 4%	9 18%	0 0%	1 2%	12 24%	20 40%
	F	2 4%	1 2%	2 4%	2 4%	2 4%	1 2%	10 20%	31 61%
NU	M	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	5 10%	5 10%	2 4%	7 14%	29 58%
	F	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%	3 6%	2 4%	9 18%	28 57%
Totals		35 9%	12 3%	11 3%	29 7%	21 5%	19 5%	56 14%	210 53%

Table 29c. Amount Reported Consumed by Subject's Mother and Father.

		Light/ Light	Light/ Moderate	Light/ Heavy	Moderate/ Light	Moderate/ Moderate	Moderate/ Heavy	Heavy/ Light	Heavy/ Moderate	Heavy/ Heavy	Does Not Answer
H	M	20 40%	12 24%	1 2%	0 0%	8 16%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	3 6%
	F	21 42%	9 18%	0 0%	3 6%	7 14%	2 4%	2 4%	3 6%	1 2%	2 4%
W	M	21 42%	14 28%	2 4%	2 4%	4 8%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%
	F	23 46%	8 16%	0 0%	0 0%	13 26%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4 8%
U	M	34 68%	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%	6 12%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	3 6%
	F	32 63%	7 14%	3 6%	0 0%	5 10%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%
NU	M	28 56%	13 26%	1 2%	2 4%	4 8%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	26 53%	8 16%	3 6%	1 2%	6 12%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	3 6%
Totals		205 51%	74 19%	11 3%	9 2%	53 13%	10 3%	5 1%	5 1%	7 2%	20 5%

In part as a measure of the centrality of parents to various aspects of the "rite de passage" to adolescent status, subjects were asked with whom they drank alcoholic beverages during their earliest drinking experiences. These data are presented below in Table 30.

Table 30a. Subjects' Reports of Persons with Whom They Did Their Earliest Drinking.

		Mother/ Father	Other Relatives	Neighbor-hood Friends (Male)	Neighbor-hood Friends (Female)	School Friends (Male)	School Friends (Female)	Friends (General)	Other
H	M	2 4%	4 8%	10 20%	5 10%	14 28%	6 12%	17 34%	3 6%
	F	7 14%	3 6%	6 12%	3 6%	10 20%	11 22%	11 22%	2 4%
W	M	4 8%	0 0%	8 16%	4 8%	7 14%	5 10%	15 30%	2 4%
	F	7 14%	1 2%	4 8%	4 8%	5 10%	4 8%	15 30%	0 0%
U	M	10 20%	4 8%	13 26%	8 16%	25 50%	12 24%	11 22%	2 4%
	F	17 34%	6 12%	4 8%	4 8%	22 44%	17 34%	16 32%	1 2%
NU	M	14 28%	6 12%	9 18%	3 6%	20 40%	9 18%	13 26%	0 0%
	F	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	1 2%
Totals		62 16%	24 6%	54 14%	31 8%	103 26%	64 16%	100 25%	11 3%

Table 30b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 30a.

		Parents	Friends
H	M	O = 6.00 E = 12.08	O = 55.00 E = 48.92
	F	O = 10.00 E = 10.50	O = 43.00 E = 42.50
W	M	O = 4.00 E = 8.91	O = 41.00 E = 36.09
	F	O = 8.00 E = 7.92	O = 32.00 E = 32.08
U	M	O = 14.00 E = 16.83	O = 71.00 E = 68.17
	F	O = 13.00 E = 15.25	O = 64.00 E = 61.75
NU	M	O = 20.00 E = 14.65	O = 54.00 E = 59.35
	F	O = 25.00 E = 13.86	O = 45.00 E = 56.14

Chi Square = 21.8200 for 7 d.f.
$p < .01$

Table 30 indicates that for the male hippies and weekenders, and to a far lesser extent the male and female users, drinking of alcoholic beverages with parents occurred less frequently than would be expected, while more drinking than would be expected took place with friends. Since adolescents regard drinking as one of the milestones of social development it is interesting to note that only the non users share this activity with their parents more frequently than would be expected.

The subjects were also asked whether they had family members who experienced difficulties related to drugs, alcoholism, etc. Their answers are shown below in Table 31.

Table 31a. Instances of Family Members Having a Drug- or Alcohol-Related Problem.

		Yes	No
H	M	16 32%	34 68%
	F	12 24%	38 76%
W	M	8 16%	42 84%
	F	11 22%	38 76%
U	M	10 20%	40 80%
	F	6 12%	42 84%
NU	M	1 2%	46 92%
	F	6 12%	42 84%
Totals		70 18%	322 81%

Table 31b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 31a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 16.00 E = 9.03	O = 34.00 E = 40.97
	F	O = 12.00 E = 9.03	O = 38.00 E = 40.97
W	M	O = 8.00 E = 9.03	O = 42.00 E = 40.97
	F	O = 11.00 E = 8.85	O = 38.00 E = 40.15
U	M	O = 10.00 E = 9.03	O = 40.00 E = 40.97
	F	O = 6.00 E = 8.67	O = 42.00 E = 39.33
NU	M	O = 2.00 E = 8.67	O = 46.00 E = 39.33
	F	O = 6.00 E = 8.67	O = 42.00 E = 39.33

Chi Square = 16.9281 for 7 d.f.
$p<.05$

As may be seen from an inspection of Table 31, more of both the male and female hippies, and more of the weekender females, than would be expected report the existence of family members with drug- and alcohol-related problems. This is somewhat puzzling in light of the previously reported lack of differences among parents of the four groups in drinking patterns. However, it should be noted that that question dealt only with parental behavior, and this one deals with all family members. Here again, this might be taken as some indication of family disruption or tension.

Respondents were questioned regarding whether or not they had been arrested on drug charges and whether or not they had ever been arrested for other than drug charges. These data are presented below in Tables 32 and 33.

Table 32. Number of Respondents Arrested on Drug Charges.

		Yes	No
H	M	11 22%	39 78%
	F	6 12%	44 88%
W	M	14 28%	36 72%
	F	3 6%	47 94%
U	M	1 2%	49 98%
	F	0 0%	50 100%
Totals		35 12%	265 88%

Table 33. Number of Arrests for Other than Drug Charges.

		Yes	No
H	M	24 48%	26 52%
	F	8 16%	42 84%
W	M	17 34%	33 66%
	F	9 18%	41 82%
U	M	8 16%	42 84%
	F	3 6%	47 94%
NU	M	7 14%	43 86%
	F	0 0%	49 98%
Totals		76 19%	323 81%

As might be expected, more of the hippies and weekenders had a history of any kind of arrests than is the case among the users and the non users. It is also interesting to note that arrests are far more common, across all groups, among males than among females. Finally, examination of these tables reveals that arrests for other than drug charges are far more common than drug arrests. Hence, 48% of the hippie males and 34% of the weekender males had been arrested on other than drug charges.

SUMMARY

The major findings with regard to the demographic profile and the background characteristics of the study respondents can be summarized as follows:

1) The male hippies and the weekenders, both male and female, come from less socially prestigious, less well-to-do backgrounds than do the users and the non users. More of the female hippies come from affluent backgrounds. The data are suggestive of the possibility that while for males "hippieness" is a flight from modest circumstances, for females the flight is from affluence. The users, like the female hippies, come from relatively affluent backgrounds. The users come from higher socio-economic families than do the non users.

2) More of the hippies and weekenders have dropped out of school. However, the majority have not dropped out prior to some time spent in college.

3) The hippies tend to be less religious than the other groups. Forty percent of the hippies and weekenders are of Jewish origin. A relatively large number of hippie subjects come from religiously mixed marriages. The non users tend to be more religious than the users; in fact, the non users are the most religiously observant group.

4) Politically, the hippies, weekenders, and users can be characterized as "left" of the non users. There are no striking differences found among the parents of subjects in the various groups.

5) There is a marked tendency toward family tension among the families of hippies and weekenders, in terms of broken families, frequency of arguments, and relative lack of family closeness. Many of their homes are characterized by instability, tension, and breakdown. In contrast, the users and non users come from relatively more stable homes which are characterized by a feeling of family unity and a relative absence of arguments.

6) More subjects among the hippies and weekenders smoke, but fewer use alcohol, than is the case among the users and the non users. No differences are found in terms of drinking habits of the parents of subjects in the four groups. However, more of the hippies report instances of family members who have a drug- or alcohol-related problem.

DRUG ORIENTATION AND PRACTICES

B. Drug Orientation and Practices:

As was noted previously, a drug user was defined as anyone who used marijuana or hashish once a month or who reported using any other drug, e.g., LSD, methadrine, DMT, STP, opium, etc., on more than two occasions.

What follows is a general description of the nature and patterns of drug use, the factors accompanying and antedating initial drug use, the experiences that the participants have had with various drugs, and the reasons given for discontinued use of various substances. It will be noted that only three of the four major groups are included in this discussion; this is because none of the "drug questions" were presented to the non-user group. In retrospect, this omission is unfortunate, as it forestalls the possibility of comparing perceptions about drugs, and certain life experiences, between those who are users and those who are not.

Presented below in Tables 34 and 35 are data on the age at which the respondents first smoked marijuana, and first used another drug, respectively.

Table 34a. Age at Which Subjects First Used Marijuana: Mean, Standard Deviation.

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	18.449	4.708
	2 Weekenders	50	18.440	4.583
	3 Users	49	18.755	3.242
Females	4 Hippies	50	16.880	3.051
	5 Weekenders	47	17.149	2.721
	6 Users	49	19.122	3.618

Table 34b. Analysis of Variance Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 34b.

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	4306.558	293			
Treat	200.551	5	40.110	2.813	
Factor 1	95.942	2	47.971	3.365	.05
Factor 2	50.402	1	50.402	3.535	NS
1 Times 2	54.206	2	27.103	1.901	
Resid.	4106.007	288	14.257		

Table 34c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 34a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 6 - Mean 4	2.242*	2.157
Mean 6 - Mean 5	1.973	2.124
Mean 6 - Mean 2	.682	2.083
Mean 6 - Mean 1	.673	2.027
Mean 6 - Mean 3	.367	1.945
Mean 3 - Mean 4	1.875	2.124
Mean 3 - Mean 5	1.606	2.083
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.315	2.027
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.306	1.945
Mean 1 - Mean 4	1.569	2.083
Mean 1 - Mean 5	1.300	2.027
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.009	1.945
Mean 2 - Mean 4	1.560	2.027
Mean 2 - Mean 5	1.291	1.945
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.269	1.945

Table 35a. Age of Respondent at Time of First Drug Experience, Other than Marijuana: Mean, Standard Deviation.

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	19.184	4.588
	2 Weekenders	47	19.106	4.614
	3 Users	34	19.824	4.033
Females	4 Hippies	46	17.370	2.800
	5 Weekenders	41	17.098	2.387
	6 Users	36	18.750	3.320

Table 35b. Analysis of Variance Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 35a.

Source	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	3817.083	252			
Treat	241.249	5	48.250	3.333	
Factor 1	54.650	2	27.325	1.887	NS
Factor 2	170.019	1	170.019	11.744	.01
1 Times 2	16.580	2	8.290	.573	
Resid.	3575.834	247	14.477		

Table 35c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 35a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 3 - Mean 5	2.726*	2.372
Mean 3 - Mean 4	2.454*	2.335
Mean 3 - Mean 6	1.074	2.290
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.718	2.229
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.640	2.139
Mean 1 - Mean 5	2.086	2.335
Mean 1 - Mean 4	1.814	2.290
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.434	2.229
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.078	2.139
Mean 2 - Mean 5	2.008	2.290
Mean 2 - Mean 4	1.736	2.229
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.356	2.139
Mean 6 - Mean 5	1.652	2.229
Mean 6 - Mean 4	1.380	2.139
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.272	2.139

The Duncan Multiple Range Test was used in effecting inter-group comparisons. While it is recognized that this test is intended for equal cell Ns, two further considerations are relevant, when contemplating its use. First, if the differences among the cell Ns are so small as to yield a non-significant Chi Square value when the "observed" frequency is the actual cell N, and the "expected" frequency is the expected equal cell N number, there appears to be little reason why this test cannot be applied. Further, upon reflection it becomes obvious that we are considering here a type II error, i.e., failing to show a statistically significant difference when such, in fact, exists among the total population. Given this latter consideration, and having established through the application of a Chi Square test that the differences among cell Ns are not sufficiently great to yield a significant Chi Square, it is felt appropriate to use the Duncan Multiple Range Test. This practice will be followed in future applications of the test, although it will not be mentioned specifically again.

It is interesting to note that while with regard to marijuana there is a significant "group difference," there is no difference between the sexes in terms of age of first use. As is indicated by an examination of the Duncan Multiple Range Tests, the only difference among the groups with respect to the age at which subjects first used marijuana is between the female users and the female hippies.

While it is somewhat surprising to make note of the uniformity among most groups, it is more than possible that the seeming lack of significant difference is a statistical artifact, born of two factors. First, the great age range of subjects doubtless accounts for considerable error variance; second, the rapid recent change in patterns of drug use among all groups might tend to obscure differences between different groups.

Turning now to the question of use of other drugs, we see that there is a significant sex difference between the male users and the female weekenders, and between the male users and the female hippies. This would appear to be yet another confirmation of the supposition that for a female to have joined either of these groups, greater impetus toward acting out, and at an earlier age than among males,is characteristic.

Parenthetically, it will be noted that the above age distributions appear to be highly leptokurdic, which is as should be, i.e., one would hardly expect to have a normal distribution with a mean of 18, a standard deviation of perhaps 6, with a percentage of the population starting to use marijuana at age 1! However, an examination of the distributions themselves indicates that this is a somewhat positively skewed distribution, with several subjects reporting initial contact with marijuana in their early 30s. Again, however, this does not appear to be worth discussing at this point, since this reflects only the status of drug use at the time the data were collected and the manner in which they were collected. That is, while there are individuals in their late 20s, 30s, 40s, and above, who use marijuana and other drugs, the drug users in this study were matched for age with the hippie sample, which was drawn from a relatively young age group, with only a few exceptions.

Presented below, in Table 36 are data reflecting the frequency of marijuana usage, among the relevant study groups.

Table 36a. Frequency of Reported Marijuana Use Among Study Respondents.

		Every Day	6 Times/ Week	3-5 Times/ Week	1-2 Times/ Week	3 Times/ Month	Once a Month
H	M	13 26%	3 6%	10 20%	15 30%	4 8%	2 4%
	F	17 34%	2 4%	9 18%	12 24%	4 8%	5 10%
W	M	15 30%	3 6%	10 20%	13 26%	7 14%	2 4%
	F	10 20%	0 0%	18 36%	13 26%	5 10%	3 6%
U	M	4 8%	2 4%	5 10%	9 18%	7 14%	23 46%
	F	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%	12 24%	10 20%	24 48%
Totals		60 20%	10 3%	55 18%	74 25%	37 12%	59 20%

Table 36b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 36a.

		Frequently (Every Day - 3-5 Times/Week)	Occasionally (1-2 Times/Week - Once a Month)
H	M	O = 26.00 E = 19.92	O = 21.00 E = 27.08
	F	O = 28.00 E = 20.76	O = 21.00 E = 28.24
W	M	O = 28.00 E = 21.19	O = 22.00 E = 28.81
	F	O = 28.00 E = 20.76	O = 21.00 E = 28.24
U	M	O = 11.00 E = 21.19	O = 39.00 E = 28.81
	F	O = 4.00 E = 21.19	O = 46.00 E = 28.81

Chi Square = 48.4755 for 5 d.f.
$p<.01$

As will be seen from an inspection of Table 36 above, more of the hippies and weekenders report smoking marijuana with fairly high frequency than would be expected, while the reverse is true among the non hippies. Fifty-five percent of the hippie groups use marijuana three to five times a week or more, whereas only 15% use marijuana this frequently among the users. The differences

in patterns of use are quite striking. The female users are clearly not very frequent users. In fact 48% of them smoke once a month, and another 44% smoke approximately once a week. As has already been seen, the female users begin marijuana use at a relatively later age. Taken together these findings suggest that for the female users in our sample, marijuana does not occupy a major role. Among the male users, almost one out of four uses marijuana three to five times a week or more, although again the majority use it with considerably less frequency.

The data which deal with the issue of whether marijuana smoking is a relatively solitary activity or a group activity are presented below in Table 37.

Table 37a. Numbers of Individuals with Whom Respondents Report Typically Smoking Marijuana.

		Alone	With One Person	Small Group	Large Group	Other
H	M	2 4%	10 20%	21 42%	5 10%	8 16%
	F	6 12%	11 22%	26 52%	3 6%	3 6%
W	M	6 12%	10 20%	27 54%	2 4%	5 10%
	F	1 2%	8 16%	32 64%	5 10%	3 6%
U	M	2 4%	9 18%	33 66%	3 6%	3 6%
	F	0 0%	7 14%	38 76%	4 8%	1 2%
Totals		17 6%	55 18%	177 59%	22 7%	23 8%

Table 37b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 37a.

		Alone or with One Person	Small or Large Group
H	M	O = 12.00 E = 10.10	O = 26.00 E = 27.90
	F	O = 17.00 E = 12.22	O = 29.00 E = 33.78
W	M	O = 16.00 E = 11.96	O = 29.00 E = 33.04
	F	O = 9.00 E = 12.22	O = 37.00 E = 33.78
U	M	O = 11.00 E = 12.49	O = 36.00 E = 34.51
	F	O = 7.00 E = 13.02	O = 42.00 E = 35.98

Chi Square = 10.0831 for 5 d.f.
NS

As will be noted from an inspection of Table 37b, the calculated value of Chi Square falls far short of statistical significance. Thus, there are no significant departures from expected cell frequencies, i.e., there are no discernable differences among the groups. What is particularly interesting here is the finding that by far the greatest proportion (66%) of all subjects smoking marijuana report that they smoke in a group setting; marijuana smoking tends not to be a solitary act, nor an act shared with only one other (23%).

Subjects were asked whether they had ever sold marijuana. Responses to this question are presented below, in Table 38.

Table 38a. Number of Subjects Reporting Having Sold, or Not Sold, Marijuana.

		Yes	No
H	M	30 60%	17 34%
	F	26 52%	24 48%
W	M	24 48%	26 52%
	F	15 30%	34 68%
U	M	16 32%	31 62%
	F	8 16%	41 82%
Totals		119 40%	173 58%

Table 38b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 38a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 30.00 E = 19.15	O = 17.00 E = 27.85
	F	O = 26.00 E = 20.38	O = 24.00 E = 29.62
W	M	O = 24.00 E = 20.38	O = 26.00 E = 29.62
	F	O = 15.00 E = 19.97	O = 34.00 E = 29.03
U	M	O = 16.00 E = 19.15	O = 31.00 E = 27.85
	F	O = 8.00 E = 19.97	O = 41.00 E = 29.03

Chi Square = 29.1453 for 5 d.f.
$p<.001$

As will be noted from an inspection of Table 38b, there is a highly significant difference shown by the value of the Chi Square. It is apparent that a far greater number of the hippies, and of the weekender males, sell marijuana than would be expected. The reverse is true for weekender females and for the user groups. Despite the "statistical difference," it is to be noted that all

the groups do engage in "selling" - i.e., approximately one-fourth of the users had "dealt." It is interesting to note that the female users do less selling than any other group, a finding which supports the impression that they are not very heavily involved in the marijuana scene.

The responses to a question asking respondents whether or not they turn other people on to marijuana are presented below below in Table 39.

Table 39a. Number of Respondents Reporting Turning Others on to Marijuana.

		Yes	No
H	M	44 88%	3 6%
	F	43 86%	7 14%
W	M	41 82%	9 18%
	F	38 76%	11 22%
U	M	26 52%	21 42%
	F	25 50%	25 50%
Totals		217 72%	76 25%

Table 39b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 39a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 44.00 E = 34.81	O = 3.00 E = 12.19
	F	O = 43.00 E = 37.03	O = 7.00 E = 12.97
W	M	O = 41.00 E = 37.03	O = 9.00 E = 12.97
	F	O = 38.00 E = 36.29	O = 11.00 E = 12.71
U	M	O = 26.00 E = 34.81	O = 21.00 E = 12.19
	F	O = 25.00 E = 37.03	O = 25.00 E = 12.97

Chi Square = 38.6797 for 5 d.f.
$p<.001$

As will be noted from an examination of Tables 39 a and b, a relatively greater proportion of the hippies and weekenders turn others on than would be expected, while the opposite is true among the users. Still it is to be noted that half of the users do turn other people on. This tends to dispel the picture of the "drug freak" as the only person who supplies others with marijuana.

At the inception of the study it was expected that the hippie groups would be drug proselytizers, while the same would not be true of the users who were expected to be more covert in their drug-related behavior. Thus, a question asking whether the people turned on were generally previous users or not was expected to elicit considerably different response patterns among these groups. The actual data are presented below in Table 40.

Table 40. Responses to the Question: "Among the people you've turned on, were they generally previous users or not?"

		Yes	No	Both
H	M	34 68%	6 12%	5 10%
	F	42 84%	3 6%	0 0%
W	M	34 68%	6 12%	2 4%
	F	32 64%	6 12%	0 0%
U	M	22 44%	5 10%	0 0%
	F	23 46%	3 6%	0 0%
Totals		187 62%	29 10%	7 2%

A Chi Square analysis performed on the data presented in Table 40 yielded a value of 2.8041 for five degrees of freedom - a decidedly non-significant value of Chi Square. That is, approximately equivalent proportions of respondents in all groups report having turned on only previous users, or neophytes as the case might be. It seems that the vast majority of people turned on by marijuana smokers are other marijuana smokers, rather than the uninitiated. This tends to dispel the popular image of the active "pusher" of marijuana who in effect forces others to become involved. Rather, it seems that marijuana smoking is a shared activity among groups of previous smokers.

Subjects were asked how much they usually spent for marijuana per month. Responses to this question are tabulated below in Table 41.

Table 41a. Amounts Usually Spent per Month for Marijuana, as Reported by the Various Study Groups.

		None	Less Than $5	$5-10	$11-20	$21-50	More Than $50
H	M	18 36%	8 16%	8 16%	12 24%	3 6%	0 0%
	F	29 58%	5 10%	3 6%	6 12%	3 6%	2 4%
W	M	17 34%	9 18%	9 18%	7 14%	5 10%	3 6%
	F	29 58%	2 4%	9 18%	6 12%	3 6%	0 0%
U	M	23 46%	10 20%	8 16%	3 6%	2 4%	2 4%
	F	35 70%	7 14%	1 2%	5 10%	2 4%	0 0%
Totals		151 50%	41 14%	38 13%	39 13%	18 6%	7 2%

Table 41b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 41a.

		None	Less Than $10	More Than $10
H	M	O = 18.00 E = 25.17	O = 16.00 E = 13.17	O = 15.00 E = 10.67
	F	O = 29.00 E = 24.65	O = 8.00 E = 12.90	O = 11.00 E = 10.45
W	M	O = 17.00 E = 25.68	O = 18.00 E = 13.44	O = 15.00 E = 10.88
	F	O = 29.00 E = 25.17	O = 11.00 E = 13.17	O = 9.00 E = 10.67
U	M	O = 23.00 E = 24.65	O = 18.00 E = 12.90	O = 7.00 E = 10.45
	F	O = 35.00 E = 25.68	O = 8.00 E = 13.44	O = 7.00 E = 10.88

Chi Square = 24.5433 for 10 d.f.
$p < .01$

In reviewing the data presented in Table 41b, it would seem that the significant Chi Square value arises largely from a difference among the sexes, i.e., a greater proportion of the women than would be expected obtain marijuana free, women's liberation to the contrary! Otherwise, the patterns across the table are relatively uniform. It is interesting to note that

Table 43a. Number of Subjects Reporting Current or Previous Use of Hashish.

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	42 84%	6 12%
	F	40 80%	6 12%
W	M	41 82%	3 6%
	F	35 70%	4 8%
U	M	23 46%	10 20%
	F	24 48%	14 28%
Totals		205 68%	43 14%

Table 43b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 43a.

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	O = 42.00 E = 39.68	O = 6.00 E = 8.32
	F	O = 40.00 E = 38.02	O = 6.00 E = 7.98
W	M	O = 41.00 E = 36.37	O = 3.00 E = 7.63
	F	O = 35.00 E = 32.24	O = 4.00 E = 6.76
U	M	O = 23.00 E = 27.28	O = 10.00 E = 5.72
	F	O = 24.00 E = 31.41	O = 14.00 E = 6.59

Chi Square = 20.0941 for 5 d.f.
$p < .01$

As will be noted from the above data, the vast majority (82%) of drug-using respondents report current or prior use of hashish. The significant Chi Square result suggests that a greater number of hippies and weekenders than would be expected use hashish, the converse being true among the users, and that a greater number than would be expected of the users terminated their earlier use of the substance; i.e., the users are over-represented in the "have used, but not now" category.

In reviewing the "order of exposure" data presented below, in Table 44, it is apparent that as marijuana is relatively consistently the first or second drug to which subjects are exposed, hashish is most generally the second or third drug to which they exposed.

Table 44. Order of Exposure to Hashish Among the Study Subjects.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
H	M	1 2%	30 60%	9 18%	2 4%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	1 2%	24 48%	10 20%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%
W	M	0 0%	32 64%	5 10%	5 10%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	4 8%	27 54%	4 8%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%
U	M	2 4%	19 38%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	6 12%	21 42%	5 10%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Totals		14 5%	153 51%	36 12%	13 4%	5 2%	2 1%	1 0%	0 0%	2 1%

Subjects were questioned as to their current or previous use of mescalin. The responses to this question are presented below in Table 45. No Chi Square analysis was performed because of the excessively small size of some of the cell Ns.

Table 45. Number of Subjects Reporting Current or Past Use of Mescalin.

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	20 40%	10 20%
	F	18 36%	5 10%
W	M	16 32%	11 22%
	F	12 24%	5 10%
U	M	7 14%	3 6%
	F	1 2%	6 12%
Totals		74 25%	40 13%

A minority of study subjects (38%) use or have used mescalin. This figure ranges from a high of 53% among the hippies to 44% among the weekenders to only 17% among the users.

In terms of order of exposure to mescalin, the data are presented below, in Table 46.

Table 46. Reported Order of Exposure to Mescalin.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
H	M	2 4%	2 4%	5 10%	3 6%	6 12%	7 14%	1 2%	0 0%	2 4%
	F	0 0%	1 2%	4 8%	3 6%	5 10%	1 2%	4 8%	1 2%	0 0%
W	M	2 4%	0 0%	4 8%	5 10%	5 10%	3 6%	4 8%	1 2%	0 0%
	F	0 0%	0 0%	3 6%	6 12%	4 8%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
U	M	0 0%	1 2%	3 6%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	3 6%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Totals		4 1%	4 1%	20 7%	22 7%	23 8%	15 5%	12 4%	2 1%	2 1%

As may be seen from an inspection of Table 46, the reported order of exposure to mescalin is fairly well dispersed, i.e., ranging from first to ninth.

Subjects were asked whether or not they had used LSD. Responses to this question are presented below, in Table 47. No Chi Square analysis was performed because of the small size of some cell entries.

Table 47. Number of Subjects Reporting Current or Past Use of LSD.

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	29 58%	8 16%
	F	23 46%	10 20%
W	M	24 48%	11 22%
	F	18 36%	5 10%
U	M	9 18%	6 12%
	F	1 2%	4 8%
Totals		104 35%	44 15%

As will be noted from an inspection of Table 47, more of the hippies and the weekenders, and fewer of the users report either past or current use of LSD. Within the various groups this ranges from 70% among the hippies, to 58% among the weekenders, to 20% among the users.

In terms of order of exposure, as is shown below in Table 48, only one person reports having been exposed first to LSD.

Table 48. Reported Order of Exposure to LSD Among the Study Subjects.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
H	M	0 0%	2 4%	9 18%	14 28%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	4 8%	8 16%	8 16%	4 8%	4 8%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
W	M	0 0%	6 12%	10 20%	5 10%	6 12%	5 10%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%
	F	1 2%	3 6%	9 18%	3 6%	3 6%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%
U	M	0 0%	1 2%	4 8%	4 8%	4 8%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%
	F	0 0%	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Totals		1 0%	17 6%	43 14%	34 11%	22 7%	12 4%	1 0%	4 1%	1 0%

It would seem that, for most subjects, LSD was the third, fourth or fifth drug used.

Subjects were asked whether or not they used, or had used, heroin. Responses to this question are presented below, in Table 49.

Table 49. Number of Subjects Reporting Current or Past Use of Heroin.

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	4 8%	7 14%
	F	3 6%	8 16%
W	M	4 8%	9 18%
	F	3 6%	4 8%
U	M	2 4%	4 8%
	F	0 0%	2 4%
Totals		16 5%	34 11%

No Chi Square analysis of these data was possible because of the small size of some of the cell frequencies.

Twenty-two percent of the hippies, 20% of the weekenders and 8% of the users are current or previous users of heroin. Of particular interest is the finding that a majority of subjects from all groups report having discontinued use. The reasons for termination of use are discussed later in this section.

Data regarding the use of DMT, DET, STP, are presented below, in Table 50. Again, no Chi Square analysis was possible because of small cell entries.

Table 50. Reported Use of DMT, DET, STP.

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	13 26%	15 30%
	F	8 16%	12 24%
W	M	10 20%	13 26%
	F	7 14%	7 14%
U	M	3 6%	4 8%
	F	1 2%	6 12%
Totals		42 14%	57 19%

Thirty-three percent of all subjects report that they use or have used these substances. This ranges from a high of 48% among the hippies, to 37% among the weekenders, to a low of 14% among the users. There seems to be a sex difference, i.e., more of the men, proportionately, than women, use these substances.

The data relating to barbiturate usage are presented below, in Table 51.

Table 51. Reported Current or Prior Use of Barbiturates.

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	4 8%	19 38%
	F	4 8%	9 18%
W	M	6 12%	12 24%
	F	8 16%	8 16%
U	M	2 4%	4 8%
	F	0 0%	3 6%
Totals		24 8%	55 18%

Twenty-six percent of all subjects report current or prior use of barbiturates, ranging from a high of slightly over a third among both the hippies and weekenders, to a low of nine percent among the users. Aside from the vastly different rate of current and prior usage among the hippies and weekenders on the one hand, as contrasted with the users on the other, the data presented above show one other interesting characteristic of barbiturate usage. That is, whereas 18% of all subjects report prior use of barbiturates, only eight percent of all subjects report current use. This phenomenon is preserved among nearly all groups, i.e., over twice as many report prior usage as report current usage.

Data relating to methadrine usage are presented below, in Table 52.

Table 52. Reported Current and Prior Use of Methadrine.

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	8 16%	15 30%
	F	3 6%	14 28%
W	M	10 20%	11 22%
	F	6 12%	7 14%
U	M	2 4%	3 6%
	F	0 0%	3 6%
Totals		29 10%	53 18%

Twenty-seven percent of all subjects report methadrine use; among hippies 40% report such usage, 34% of the weekenders report methadrine use, and among users, only eight percent make such report. Thus, a far greater number of hippies and weekenders of both sexes use or have used methadrine than is the case among the users. There appears, in addition, to be a sex difference, i.e., a greater number of males use methadrine than do females. It is interesting to note, in light of adverse publicity that had been given methadrine at the time of the study (e.g., "Speed kills"), that approximately twice as many subjects report prior usage as report current use. Whether this may be attributed specifically to the campaign against methadrine is impossible to determine.

The data pertaining to use of other amphetamines is presented below, in Table 53.

Table 53. Number of Subjects Reporting Current or Prior Use of "Other Amphetamines."

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	11 22%	18 36%
	F	5 10%	15 30%
W	M	11 22%	14 28%
	F	11 22%	7 14%
U	M	4 8%	5 10%
	F	5 10%	5 10%
Totals		48 16%	66 22%

As will be noted from an inspection of Table 53, a greater number of hippies (49%) and weekenders (43%) report amphetamine usage than do the users (19%). Still, one out of five of the users "use now" or "have used" amphetamines other than methadrine. It is interesting to note again that a greater number of subjects report discontinued use of "other amphetamines" than report current use; again, this may reflect the reaction to growing information as to the possible deleterious effects of amphetamine usage.

Finally, subjects were asked whether they use , or had used, opium or cocaine. Responses to this question are shown below, in Table 54.

Table 54. Number of Subjects in the Various Groups Reporting Current or Prior Use of Opium or Cocaine.

		Use Now	Have Used But Not Now
H	M	14 28%	17 34%
	F	12 24%	9 18%
W	M	6 12%	14 28%
	F	8 16%	6 12%
U	M	3 6%	7 14%
	F	1 2%	6 12%
Totals		44 15%	59 20%

Again, as we have come to expect, a relatively greater number of the hippies (52%) and weekenders (33%) report use of opium and cocaine than do users (17%). This does appear to be a sex-linked phenomenon, in that a seemingly smaller proportion of females report such usage than do males. Again, more subjects report termination of use than report current use of the drug.

It will have been noted that the "order of exposure" data for the last several substances have been omitted. This is because there is wide dispersion of reported orders of exposure, ranging for every drug between second and ninth. This being the case, there seems little point in presenting each of the "order of exposure" tables separately.

In reviewing the data presented immediately above, it is clear that more of the hippies use all drugs than do any other group, followed by the weekenders, and trailed by the users. Among the majority of users drugs other than marijuana and hashish are not used by more than one in five. The mean age of the users is 22, and the mean age for first marijuana use is about 19. This means that among these particular subjects who have been using marijuana for about three years, in the vast majority of instances drug use has not "progressed" to substances other than marijuana.

There is a tendency for more of the males in all of the groups to report the use of many drugs. Finally, there does appear to be a tendency for many of the respondents to have terminated use of what have become known as the "dangerous" drugs. In fact, as is shown below in Table 55, an appreciable number of the respondents report that there are drugs that they would not use again.

Table 55a. Number of Subjects Reporting that There Are Drugs that They Would Not Use Again.

		Yes	No
H	M	30 60%	18 36%
	F	26 52%	23 46%
W	M	24 48%	26 52%
	F	19 38%	30 60%
U	M	8 16%	27 54%
	F	16 32%	30 60%
Totals		123 41%	154 51%

Table 55b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 55a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 30.00 E = 21.31	O = 18.00 E = 26.69
	F	O = 26.00 E = 21.76	O = 23.00 E = 27.24
W	M	O = 24.00 E = 22.20	O = 26.00 E = 27.80
	F	O = 19.00 E = 21.76	O = 30.00 E = 27.24
U	M	O = 8.00 E = 15.54	O = 27.00 E = 19.46
	F	O = 16.00 E = 20.43	O = 30.00 E = 25.57

Chi Square = 17.0525 for 5 d.f.
$p<.01$

As will be noted, approximately 41% of all respondents indicate that there are drugs that they would not use again. The results of the Chi Square analysis indicate that the proportion is higher among the hippies and weekenders. Apparently, in their wider use of drugs the hippies and weekenders are more apt than the users to have had "bad" experiences with, or to have satisfied their curiosity about, various substances.

Subjects were asked which one drug other than marijuana they like most. Answers to this question are tabulated below, in Table 56.

Table 56a. Responses to Questions Asking Subjects Which Drug Other than Marijuana They Like the Most.

		None	Hashish	Peyote	LSD	Heroin	DMT DET STP	Barbi-turates	Metha-drine	Other Amphet-amines	Opium Cocaine
H	M	0 0%	17 34%	5 10%	21 42%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	18 36%	6 12%	11 22%	3 6%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	2 4%	4 8%
W	M	1 2%	19 38%	8 16%	8 16%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%	3 6%	2 4%
	F	2 4%	21 42%	3 6%	10 20%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%
U	M	8 16%	16 32%	3 6%	3 6%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	17 34%	20 40%	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%
Totals		28 9%	111 37%	26 9%	56 19%	6 2%	4 1%	3 1%	5 2%	8 3%	10 3%

Table 56b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 56a.

		Hashish	Peyote or LSD
H	M	O = 17.00 E = 24.73	O = 26.00 E = 18.27
	F	O = 18.00 E = 20.13	O = 17.00 E = 14.87
W	M	O = 19.00 E = 20.13	O = 16.00 E = 14.87
	F	O = 21.00 E = 19.55	O = 13.00 E = 14.45
U	M	O = 16.00 E = 12.65	O = 6.00 E = 9.35
	F	O = 20.00 E = 13.80	O = 4.00 E = 10.20

Chi Square = 15.2507 for 5 d.f.
$p < .01$

As is evident in the above tables, by far the most universally popular "other drug" is hashish. Among the male hippies, however, the one other most popular drug is LSD. It is interesting to note that approximately one-quarter of the users indicate that they like no other drug "most" - apparently they are marijuana users exclusively. This is more evident among the female users, a third of whom indicate no other drug preference, than among the males.

Presented below, in Table 57, are data arising from the question: "Have you ever sold drugs other than marijuana?"

Table 57a. Number of Subjects Reporting that They Had, or Had Not, Ever Sold Drugs Other than Marijuana.

		Yes	No
H	M	20 40%	28 56%
	F	15 30%	31 62%
W	M	21 42%	24 48%
	F	10 20%	28 56%
U	M	6 12%	18 36%
	F	3 6%	28 56%
Totals		75 25%	157 52%

Table 57b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 57a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 20.00 E = 15.52	O = 28.00 E = 32.48
	F	O = 15.00 E = 14.87	O = 31.00 E = 31.13
W	M	O = 21.00 E = 14.55	O = 24.00 E = 30.45
	F	O = 10.00 E = 12.28	O = 28.00 E = 25.72
U	M	O = 6.00 E = 7.76	O = 18.00 E = 16.24
	F	O = 3.00 E = 10.02	O = 28.00 E = 20.98

Chi Square = 14.6312 for 5 d.f.
$p<.05$

The majority of subjects within every group report that they do not sell other drugs; those who do sell are more likely to be male than female. Far fewer of the subjects report having sold drugs other than marijuana than report selling marijuana. That is, while 40% of the respondents report having sold marijuana, only 25% report having sold other drugs.

Subjects were asked whether or not they had turned on anyone to a drug other than marijuana. These data are presented below, in Table 58.

Table 58a. Number of Subjects Reporting Turning Others on to Drugs Other than Marijuana.

		Yes	No
H	M	39 78%	9 18%
	F	32 64%	11 22%
W	M	35 70%	9 18%
	F	24 48%	11 22%
U	M	18 36%	16 32%
	F	11 22%	20 40%
Totals		159 53%	76 25%

Table 58b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 58a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 39.00 E = 32.54	O = 9.00 E = 15.46
	F	O = 32.00 E = 29.15	O = 11.00 E = 13.85
W	M	O = 35.00 E = 29.83	O = 9.00 E = 14.17
	F	O = 24.00 E = 23.73	O = 11.00 E = 11.27
U	M	O = 19.00 E = 23.73	O = 16.00 E = 11.27
	F	O = 11.00 E = 21.02	O = 20.00 E = 9.98

Chi Square = 25.3858 for 5 d.f.
P<.001

Fifty-three percent of all subjects report having turned people on to drugs other than marijuana. As might be expected, the hippies report such behavior more frequently than do the weekenders who, in turn, report turning others on more often than do the users. Still, almost one-third of all users report having turned others on to drugs other than marijuana. Eighty-five percent of those who report turning on others report having turned on only previous users; twelve percent report having turned on neophytes; and three percent report having turned on both. From this, one hardly gathers the picture of the active proselytizer or pusher of various "dangerous" drugs on to innocent others.

The hippies and weekenders were asked whether or not they had already been using the drugs they had listed prior to coming to the current (hippie) community. Approximately two-fifths of the hippies, and slightly over one-half of the weekenders indicate that they had. Since, in the aggregate, over half at least expanded their drug use patterns after moving either permanently or sporadically to the East Village, it would seem that exposure to the general "Village" drug scene expands individual horizons in this regard. In general, it seems that the greater availability of drugs coupled with the closely related phenomenon of proximity of others who use, maximizes the chances that a person will become a drug user.

Subjects were asked what drugs they had begun to use after coming to the East Village. The most frequently mentioned drugs are LSD; hashish; peyote; marijuana; DMT, DET, or STP; and opium and cocaine, in that order of frequency.

The discussion of drugs thus far has focused on a description of the types of drugs used, the order of exposure to drugs, and selected aspects of interpersonal behavior as related to drug use, per se. What follows is a general discussion of the circumstances preceding and accompanying the initial use of a drug.

Subjects were asked from what source they had heard about drugs, prior to their initial ingestion. The responses to this question are tabulated below in Table 59.

Table 59. Reported Sources of Information about Drugs by Subjects.

		School	Church	News-paper	Tele-vision	Maga-zine	Public Lecture	Discussion with Friends Who Had Used	Discussion with Friends Who Had Not Used	Other
H	M	11 22%	5 10%	21 42%	14 28%	25 50%	6 12%	37 74%	21 42%	10 20%
	F	12 24%	5 10%	20 40%	10 20%	19 38%	3 6%	39 78%	15 30%	5 10%
W	M	11 22%	3 6%	14 28%	13 26%	19 38%	5 10%	37 74%	18 36%	2 4%
	F	10 20%	3 6%	11 22%	6 12%	14 28%	1 2%	32 64%	11 22%	2 4%
U	M	12 24%	3 6%	19 38%	13 26%	20 40%	8 16%	32 64%	20 40%	11 22%
	F	13 26%	3 6%	15 30%	11 22%	16 32%	1 2%	31 62%	16 32%	1 2%
Totals		69 23%	22 7%	100 33%	67 22%	113 38%	24 8%	208 69%	101 33%	31 10%

A Chi Square analysis of these data yielded a non-significant Chi Square (9.1939 for 30 degrees of freedom). By far the most frequently reported (69%) source of information is "discussion with friends who had taken the drug." Approximately one-third of the respondents report as sources of information newspapers, magazine articles, and friends who had not taken the drug. Approximately one-quarter report school or television as a source of information. Less than one-tenth report church, public lectures, or "other" as a source of information. Of these, "church" is reported least frequently. These data are important in that they underscore the importance of peers as the carriers of information and norms. This suggests, in turn, that any program aimed at educating adolescents about drug use and/or abuse should include peers, and peer group discussion.

A number of questions attempted to establish the subject's state of mind just before, or at the time when, the first drug was taken. The first question was: "Just before you took your first illegitimate drug, how would you describe your frame of mind?" Subjects could respond to this item in terms of a four point scale ranging from "miserable," to "on top of the world." The responses to this question are tabulated below, in Table 60.

Table 60a. Subjects' Descriptions of Their "Frame of Mind" Just Before Taking Their First Illegitimate Drug.

		Miserable Many Problems	Fairly Good Some Problems	Feeling Good	"On Top of the World"	Other
H	M	5 10%	21 42%	13 26%	3 6%	7 14%
	F	7 14%	25 50%	13 26%	1 2%	4 8%
W	M	4 8%	25 50%	15 30%	4 8%	2 4%
	F	5 10%	28 56%	12 24%	2 4%	1 2%
U	M	6 12%	16 32%	22 44%	3 6%	2 4%
	F	2 4%	21 42%	26 52%	1 2%	0 0%
Totals		29 10%	136 45%	101 34%	14 5%	16 5%

Table 60b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 60a.

		Problems	Feeling Good or Great
H	M	O = 26.00 E - 24.75	O = 16.00 E = 17.25
	F	O = 32.00 E = 27.11	O = 14.00 E = 18.89
W	M	O = 29.00 E = 28.29	O = 19.00 E = 19.71
	F	O = 33.00 E = 27.70	O = 14.00 E = 19.30
U	M	O = 22.00 E = 27.70	O = 25.00 E = 19.30
	F	O = 23.00 E = 29.46	O = 27.00 E = 20.54

Chi Square = 11.1263 for 5 d.f.
$p<.05$

As will be noted from an inspection of Table 60, only a relatively small minority felt "miserable" at the time of their first illegitimite drug use - about ten percent. However, the fact that 55% indicated that they were either "miserable" or that they felt "fairly good, but (with) some problems," particularly when taken in the context of the next response category, "feeling good," suggests

in this regard. As will be noted, the responses were dichotomized, in terms of "miserable" or "fairly good," on the one hand, or "feeling good" or "on top of the world," on the other. While more of the "hippies" and "weekenders" than would be expected respond in the troubled categories, fewer of the users give such responses, more of them than would be expected reporting in the less troubled response categories. On the other hand, the presence of "some problems" is fairly typical for most people, and while it may be true that initial drug use is not antedated by a feeling of euphoria, it is questionable whether it is antedated by feelings of utter misery. In other words, the popular, and to some extent the professional, image of the subjectively deeply troubled individual who turns to drugs for solace and solution is not supported by these data.

Subjects were asked the nature of their problems when they first took an illegal drug. Responses to this question are tabulated below in Table 61.

Table 61. Respondents' Descriptions of "Problems" When First Took an illegal drug.

		Feelings of Detachment From Society	Feelings of Inferiority	Difficulty Making Decisions	Lack of Meaningfulness	Lack of Direction In Life
H	M	26 52%	5 10%	8 16%	19 38%	18 36%
	F	30 60%	10 20%	7 14%	17 34%	14 28%
W	M	29 58%	7 14%	6 12%	12 24%	11 22%
	F	30 60%	6 12%	7 14%	12 24%	11 22%
U	M	21 42%	10 20%	7 14%	13 26%	12 24%
	F	12 24%	5 10%	9 18%	8 16%	8 16%
Totals		148 49%	43 14%	44 14%	81 27%	74 24%

		Lack of Attachment To One Person	Feelings of Hostility To Others	Feelings Of Futility In Material Rewards	Psychiatric Illness	Physical Illness	Other
H	M	14 28%	5 10%	5 10%	4 8%	1 2%	9 18%
	F	13 26%	6 12%	5 10%	4 8%	1 2%	9 18%
W	M	7 14%	4 8%	4 8%	0 0%	2 4%	4 8%
	F	11 22%	5 10%	5 10%	1 2%	0 0%	4 8%
U	M	12 24%	11 22%	5 10%	5 10%	0 0%	7 14%
	F	11 22%	6 12%	1 2%	3 6%	1 2%	5 10%
Totals		68 22%	37 12%	25 8%	17 5%	5 1%	38 12%

As will be noted from an inspection of Table 61, by far the greatest proportion of respondents (49%) indicate that they had problems involving "feelings of detachment from society" at the time when they took their first drug. Approximately one-quarter of the respondents report problems relating to "lack of meaningfulness," "lack of direction in life," and "lack of attachment to one person." Approximately one-tenth of the respondents indicate that they had problems relating to "feelings of hostility in contact with other people," "feelings of futility in terms of material rewards," "feelings of inferiority," and "difficulty in making decisions."

It would seem that subjectively the primary problems at the time of first illegal drug use were those relating to general feelings of rootlessness, meaninglessness, detachment, etc. - a generalized feeling of alienation. This appears to be true of all groups: the Chi Square analysis yielded a Chi Square equal to 25.2048 for 35 degrees of freedom, which falls far short of an acceptable level of significance.

Subjects were asked whether they were aware of any crisis in their life at the time they first decided to take an illegal drug. A tabulation of responses to this question, regarding a number of life areas, is presented below, in Tables 62 through 73.

Table 62. Subjects Reporting a Crisis in Life Relating to School Difficulties.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	16 32%	20 40%	12 24%
	F	17 34%	21 42%	9 18%
W	M	16 32%	22 44%	10 20%
	F	12 24%	27 54%	6 12%
U	M	11 22%	30 60%	8 16%
	F	10 20%	26 52%	14 28%
Totals		82 27%	146 49%	59 20%

Table 63. Reported Crisis in Life Relating to Job Trouble or Loss.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	4 8%	21 42%	22 44%
	F	1 2%	20 40%	23 46%
W	M	7 14%	20 40%	19 38%
	F	2 4%	24 48%	17 34%
U	M	3 6%	25 50%	19 38%
	F	5 10%	26 52%	17 34%
Totals		22 7%	136 45%	117 39%

Table 64. Reported Crisis Relating to Disappointment in Friendship or Love.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	11 22%	26 52%	11 22%
	F	12 24%	24 48%	8 16%
W	M	10 20%	24 48%	11 22%
	F	8 16%	31 62%	4 8%
U	M	9 18%	32 64%	8 16%
	F	14 28%	31 62%	5 10%
Totals		64 21%	168 56%	47 16%

Table 65. Reported Crisis in Life Relating to Emotional Problems, Feelings of Sadness or Tension.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	20 40%	19 38%	9 18%
	F	24 48%	17 34%	5 10%
W	M	22 44%	16 32%	8 16%
	F	24 48%	17 34%	4 8%
U	M	17 34%	27 54%	5 10%
	F	20 40%	23 46%	5 10%
Totals		127 42%	119 40%	36 12%

Table 66. A Crisis Relating to Difficulties with the Law

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	6 12%	32 64%	10 20%
	F	4 8%	29 58%	11 22%
W	M	7 14%	29 58%	9 18%
	F	5 10%	31 62%	7 14%
U	M	2 4%	40 80%	6 12%
	F	1 2%	37 74%	11 22%
Totals		25 8%	198 66%	54 18%

Table 67a. Reported Inability to Get Along with Own Family.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	17 34%	23 46%	8 16%
	F	21 42%	17 34%	7 14%
W	M	20 40%	20 40%	7 14%
	F	23 46%	20 40%	3 6%
U	M	14 28%	30 60%	5 10%
	F	12 24%	33 66%	5 10%
Totals		107 36%	143 48%	35 12%

Table 67b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 67a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 17.00 E = 17.12	O = 23.00 E = 22.88
	F	O = 21.00 E = 16.26	O = 17.00 E = 21.74
W	M	O = 20.00 E = 17.12	O = 20.00 E = 22.88
	F	O = 23.00 E = 18.40	O = 20.00 E = 24.60
U	M	O = 14.00 E = 18.83	O = 30.00 E = 25.17
	F	O = 12.00 E = 19.26	O = 33.00 E = 25.74

Chi Square = 12.2179 for 5 d.f.
$p < .05$

Table 68. Serious Physical Illness or Injury.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	2 4%	34 68%	10 20%
	F	0 0%	28 56%	16 32%
W	M	2 4%	31 62%	11 22%
	F	0 0%	36 72%	6 12%
U	M	0 0%	41 82%	6 12%
	F	2 4%	40 80%	8 16%
Totals		6 2%	210 70%	57 19%

Table 69. Reported Crisis Relating to Serious Mental Disorder.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	2 4%	34 68%	10 20%
	F	1 2%	28 56%	15 30%
W	M	1 2%	30 60%	13 26%
	F	3 6%	35 70%	5 10%
U	M	3 6%	39 78%	6 12%
	F	1 2%	42 84%	7 14%
Totals		11 4%	208 69%	56 19%

Table 70. Reported Problems Relating to Sexual Difficulties, Fears, or Bad Experience.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	12 24%	28 56%	8 16%
	F	5 10%	26 52%	13 26%
W	M	5 10%	29 58%	10 20%
	F	12 24%	31 62%	2 4%
U	M	6 12%	36 72%	5 10%
	F	11 22%	31 62%	8 16%
Totals		51 17%	181 60%	46 15%

Table 71. Inability to Find a "Fit" in Society.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	21 42%	18 36%	6 12%
	F	17 34%	20 40%	8 16%
W	M	15 30%	24 48%	6 12%
	F	18 36%	23 46%	3 6%
U	M	15 30%	30 60%	4 8%
	F	11 22%	30 60%	9 18%
Totals		97 32%	145 48%	36 12%

Table 72. A Crisis Relating to Upheaval in the Family, such as Divorce, Illness, Death, Drastic Financial Setback.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	5 10%	32 64%	10 20%
	F	5 10%	26 52%	14 28%
W	M	7 14%	29 58%	9 18%
	F	4 8%	34 68%	5 10%
U	M	6 12%	34 68%	7 14%
	F	4 8%	36 72%	9 18%
Totals		31 10%	191 64%	54 18%

Table 73. A Crisis Relating to Alcoholism or Drug Addiction Among Family Members and/or Self.

		Yes	No	Does Not Apply
H	M	3 6%	27 54%	12 24%
	F	1 2%	22 44%	13 26%
W	M	2 4%	26 52%	10 20%
	F	2 4%	33 66%	6 12%
U	M	0 0%	40 80%	6 12%
	F	0 0%	36 72%	12 24%
Totals		8 3%	184 61%	59 20%

Inspection of Tables 62 through 73 shows that 42% of the subjects report crises related to emotional problems, feelings of sadness or tension; 35% of subjects report inability to get along with their own families; and 32% of respondents report an inability to find a "fit" in society. It seems then, that for those respondents who perceive themselves as having "some problems" the problems are essentially grounded in feelings of generalized tension and malaise about their own functioning or in their relationships with others, either family or the broader society.

It is interesting to note that there is no difference between the groups with respect to any of the problems listed, except in the case of inability to get along with one's own family. The male and female users report fewer instances of an inability to get along with their families than do the other groups. Thus, at least in terms of subjective report, it seems that while the hippies and weekenders are more likely to see themselves as having problems, the type of problems reported do not discriminate between groups. In other words, a hippie is more likely to report that he has "some problems" than is a user, but the type of problems they report are common to both, except that the hippie is more likely to feel that he cannot get along with his family.

These data taken together with the large number of subjects (27%) reporting difficulties relating to school, are similar to the clinical experiences of Center for Community Research staff who have been involved in therapeutic drug programs. In other words, the problems mentioned most frequently are exactly those which are subscribed to by study subjects. In our experience continued drug use is often associated with an inability to find anything relevant to relate to at home, in school, or in the society at large. These adolescents tend to see all institutions, whether school, family, or society at large, as a "hassle." Most frequently they report feelings of sadness and tension which are related to their inability to function well with regard to any of these major institutions.

Subjects were asked to name the person whom they most wanted to think well of them at the time of first drug use. The responses to this question are tabulated below, in Table 74.

Table 74a. Frequency with Which Subjects Report Having Wanted Each of the Specified People to "Think Well" of Them at the Time of the Initial Drug Ingestion.

		Mother	Father	Spouse	Other Relative	Girl-Friend Boy-Friend	Other Close Friend	Other
H	M	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%	13 26%	12 24%	11 22%
	F	4 8%	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%	24 48%	8 16%	6 12%
W	M	5 10%	0 0%	2 4%	3 6%	20 40%	8 16%	7 14%
	F	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	3 6%	26 52%	9 18%	5 10%
U	M	6 12%	6 12%	2 4%	0 0%	11 22%	5 10%	1 2%
	F	3 6%	4 8%	3 6%	3 6%	26 52%	6 12%	0 0%
Totals		21 7%	13 4%	9 3%	12 4%	120 40%	48 16%	30 10%

The responses were dichotomized, for the application of Chi Square analysis. This was accomplished by distinguishing between relatives and friends.

Table 74b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 74a.

		Relative	Friend
H	M	O = 6.00 E = 9.26	O = 36.00 E = 32.74
	F	O = 6.00 E = 9.70	O = 38.00 E = 34.30
W	M	O = 10.00 E = 9.92	O = 35.00 E = 35.08
	F	O = 6.00 E = 10.14	O = 40.00 E = 35.86
U	M	O = 12.00 E = 6.39	O = 17.00 E = 22.61
	F	O = 16.00 E = 10.58	O = 32.00 E = 37.42

Chi Square = 15.3176 for 5 d.f.
$p < .01$

As will be noted from an inspection of Table 74b, the hippies and weekenders report more frequently than might be expected that the person most important in the current context is a non-relative. The users are more likely than the hippies and weekenders to report that the opinion of a relative is most important to them. Nevertheless, even among the users, the opinions of friends are more important in almost twice as many instances as are the opinions of relatives. This merely substantiates the well known fact that for most people the importance of their parents as the central force in their lives diminishes during adolescence. Also these data support other data, reported above, which suggest that drug use is a peer group phenomenon. These data are, however, also supportive of findings reported above which suggest that there is a greater feeling of solidarity and less animosity among the families of users than among the families of the hippie groups.

Presented below in Table 75 are data dealing with attitudes of the "most important" person at the time of initial ingestion.

Table 75a. Reported Attitude Toward Drug Abuse Held by the Most Important Person at the Time of Initial Ingestion.

		Favorable	Unfavorable	No Opinion	Don't Know	Not Applicable
H	M	24 48%	3 6%	6 12%	7 14%	4 8%
	F	28 56%	6 12%	3 6%	4 8%	2 4%
W	M	29 58%	4 8%	5 10%	4 8%	1 2%
	F	38 76%	3 6%	2 4%	3 6%	0 0%
U	M	15 30%	12 24%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%
	F	24 48%	12 24%	7 14%	2 4%	0 0%
Totals		158 53%	40 13%	26 9%	21 7%	7 2%

Table 75b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above, in Table 75a.

		Favorable	Unfavorable	Don't Know
H	M	O = 24.00 E = 25.90	O = 3.00 E = 6.56	O = 13.00 E = 7.54
	F	O = 28.00 E = 26.55	O = 6.00 E = 6.72	O = 7.00 E = 7.73
W	M	O = 29.00 E = 27.20	O = 4.00 E = 6.89	O = 9.00 E = 7.92
	F	O = 38.00 E = 29.79	O = 3.00 E = 7.54	O = 5.00 E = 8.67
U	M	O = 15.00 E = 20.07	O = 12.00 E = 5.08	O = 4.00 E = 5.84
	F	O = 24.00 E = 28.49	O = 12.00 E = 7.21	O = 8.00 E = 8.30

Chi Square = 29.4546 for 10 d.f.
p<.01

As will be noted from the above tables, over half (62%) of the respondents report that the person most important to them at the time of initial drug use was either favorable toward the drug or had no opinion about it. In only 13% of the cases did this most important person register an unfavorable attitude. The source of the greatest contribution to the significant Chi Square value comes from the difference between observed and expected frequencies regarding unfavorable attitudes reported by the users. That is, users in some instances have used drugs despite the disapprobation of relatives and peers. Nevertheless, these data again underline the importance of peers to the initiation and maintenance of various forms of drug behavior.

Related to this, three-quarters of the respondents indicate that they "loved" or "liked" the person who introduced them to their first illegal drug. Only nine percent report indifference to this person, and one percent report dislike. Similarly, over one-third state that they "admire" and "respect" the person who introduced them to their first drug. Related also to this is the finding that on the average, respondents had known this person approximately two years; this figure is constant across all groups. Thus again, it would seem that the individuals who initiated the respondents to drug use were well known and important; they were individuals of consequence to the respondents.

It seems clear that the influence and role of peers on drug use cannot be over emphasized. This is true in terms of sources of information about the drug, in terms of from whom, or with whom, the initial drug is obtained or ingested, and implicitly, in terms of the decision to engage in a first drug experience.

What follows is a final subsection of this Drug Section dealing with respondents' descriptions of the effects of their first drug experience, their feelings about the properties of the various drugs, and their orientation toward, and the circumstances attendant upon, termination of drug use.

First, subjects were asked to describe their reactions to their first drug experience. The responses to this question are presented below, in Table 76.

Table 76. Reactions to First Drug Experience, as Reported by Different Subject Groups.

		Enjoyment Pleasure	Threatening Frightening	Enhanced Sense Perceptions	Unusual Body Sensations	Interaction with Others	Erotic Sensual	Self-Exploration
H	M	24 48%	3 6%	23 46%	17 34%	9 18%	14 28%	15 30%
	F	31 62%	7 14%	23 46%	19 38%	15 30%	12 24%	9 18%
W	M	34 68%	3 6%	28 56%	20 40%	13 26%	15 30%	19 38%
	F	27 54%	5 10%	20 40%	20 40%	8 16%	7 14%	10 20
U	M	30 60%	9 18&	14 28%	13 26%	15 30%	10 20%	7 14%
	F	28 56%	8 16%	22 44%	14 28%	10 20%	9 18%	7 14%
Totals		174 58%	35 11%	130 43%	103 34%	70 23%	67 22%	67 22%

		Creative	Philosophical Insight	Experience of Insanity	Religious or Mystical	Ego Death Death-Rebirth	Physically Sick	No Effect	Other
H	M	13 26%	18 36%	8 16%	13 26%	9 18%	5 10%	16 32%	2 4%
	F	11 22%	8 16%	4 8%	3 6%	3 6%	4 8%	11 22%	0 0%
W	M	14 28%	16 32%	3 6%	6 12%	5 10%	4 8%	8 16%	0 0%
	F	8 16%	7 14	3 6%	5 10%	4 8%	5 10%	11 22%	0 0%
U	M	14 28%	10 20%	4 8%	5 10%	5 10%	5 10%	17 34%	2 4%
	F	12 24%	9 18%	5 10%	3 6%	5 10%	6 12%	16 32%	4 8%
Totals		72 24%	68 22%	27 9%	35 11%	31 10%	29 9%	79 26%	8 2%

As will be noted from an examination of Table 76, a majority of the respondents indicate that their first drug experience gave them enjoyment and pleasure. Slightly over 40% indicate that their first experience resulted in enhanced visual, auditory and other sense perceptions. Related to this 34% report unusual body sensations and/or distortions. Approximately one-quarter of the subjects report heightened interaction with others, erotic or sensual reactions, reactions involving self-exploration, a heightening of creative impulses or philosophical insights, or conversely, no effect at all. Approximately ten percent of the subjects found the experience threatening or frightening, or felt that the experience was one of insanity. A Chi Square analysis of these data yielded a Chi Square of 60.5545 for 65 degrees of freedom, which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

Subjects were asked to describe the properties of each of the more common drugs. The data relating to each of the substances were tabulated separately, and individual Chi Square tests applied. Not one of the Chi Square tests yielded a significant Chi Square value, so that it seems quite clear that the properties ascribed to each drug are the same regardless of group membership. The data are presented below in Tables 77 through 84.

Table 77. Frequency With Which Subjects Report Each of the Specified Properties as Being Characteristic of Amphetamines.

		Improve Studying	Improve Thinking	Intensify Perceptions	Ease Depression	Satisfy Curiosity	Get High	Facilitate Social Experience
H	M	28 56%	15 30%	14 28%	17 34%	17 34%	26 52%	9 18%
	F	32 64%	14 28%	10 20%	19 38%	15 30%	29 58%	11 22%
W	M	27 54%	14 28%	10 20%	22 44%	20 40%	21 42%	10 20%
	F	23 46%	13 26%	9 18%	17 34%	20 40%	23 46%	9 18%
U	M	21 42%	12 24%	14 28%	17 34%	18 36%	26 52%	10 20%
	F	28 56%	13 26%	11 22%	20 40%	18 36%	29 58%	17 34%
Totals		159 53%	81 27%	68 23%	112 37%	108 36%	154 51%	66 22%

		Heighten Sexual Experience	For Kicks	Challenge Values of Society	Stay Awake	Resolution of Personal Problems	The "In" Thing To Do	Intensify Feelings	Increase Creativity
H	M	9 18%	22 44%	11 22%	31 62%	10 20%	18 36%	13 26%	11 22%
	F	4 8%	20 40%	6 12%	34 68%	5 10%	11 22%	7 14%	8 16%
W	M	8 16%	16 32%	10 20%	31 62%	5 10%	9 18%	8 16%	12 24%
	F	7 14%	20 40%	6 12%	30 60%	4 8%	10 20%	11 22%	9 18%
U	M	9 18%	28 56%	11 22%	33 66%	3 6%	12 24%	9 18%	9 18%
	F	3 6%	27 54%	8 16%	41 82%	5 10%	18 36%	5 10%	3 6%
Totals		40 13%	133 44%	52 17%	200 67%	32 11%	78 26%	53 18%	52 17%

Table 78. Frequency with Which Subjects Report Each of the Specified Properties as Being Characteristic of Barbiturates.

		Relieve Tension Relax	Ease Depres-sion	Sat-isfy Curi-osity	Get High	Facil-itate Social Exper-ience	For Kicks	Chal-lenge Values of Soc-iety	Resolve Per-sonal Prob-lems	The "In" Thing To Do
H	M	20 40%	10 20%	12 24%	19 38%	4 8%	23 46%	7 14%	6 12%	8 16%
	F	26 52%	12 24%	12 24%	19 38%	4 8%	16 32%	3 6%	5 10%	8 16%
W	M	22 44%	13 26%	19 38%	12 24%	5 10%	11 22%	10 20%	5 10%	8 16%
	F	15 30%	6 12%	19 38%	18 36%	4 8%	16 32%	5 10%	4 8%	8 16%
U	M	24 48%	14 28%	14 28%	14 28%	6 12%	20 40%	7 14%	5 10%	8 16%
	F	26 52%	15 30%	12 24%	7 14%	4 8%	13 26%	8 16%	7 14%	11 22%
Totals		133 44%	70 23%	88 29%	89 30%	27 9%	99 33%	40 13%	32 11%	51 17%

Table 79. Frequency with Which Subjects Report Each of the Specified Properties as Being Characteristic of Marijuana/Hashish.

		Improve Studying	Improve Thinking	Relieve Tension Relax	Intensify Perceptions	Sharpen Religious Insight	Ease Depression	Satisfy Curiosity	Feel High
H	M	1 2%	28 56%	33 66%	37 74%	20 40%	19 38%	25 50%	34 68%
	F	5 10%	29 58%	40 80%	38 76%	19 38%	18 36%	23 46%	43 86%
W	M	5 10%	29 58%	34 68%	36 72%	23 46%	21 42%	29 58%	39 78%
	F	7 14%	29 58%	37 74%	40 80%	18 36%	14 28%	29 58%	43 86%
U	M	6 12%	19 38%	37 74%	33 66%	15 30%	25 50%	34 68%	45 90%
	F	4 8%	13 26%	17 34%	22 44%	4 8%	10 20%	18 36%	23 46%
Totals		28 9%	147 49%	198 66%	206 69%	99 33%	107 36%	158 53%	227 76%

		Deepen Self-Understanding	Facilitate Social Experience	Heighten Sexual Experience	For Kicks	Challenge Values of Society	Resolve Personal Problems	The "In" Thing To Do	Intensify Feelings	Increase Creativity
H	M	30 60%	30 60%	30 60%	26 52%	24 48%	7 14%	20 40%	30 60%	31 62%
	F	32 64%	18 36%	36 72%	19 38%	21 42%	4 8%	18 36%	36 72%	29 58%
W	M	31 62%	29 58%	32 64%	24 48%	28 56%	11 22%	22 44%	32 64%	27 54%
	F	29 58%	28 56%	34 68%	22 44%	17 34%	6 12%	20 40%	36 72%	26 52%
U	M	20 40%	34 68%	22 44%	32 64%	25 50%	9 18%	36 72%	21 42%	20 40%
	F	13 26%	15 30%	15 30%	17 34%	14 28%	5 10%	19 38%	16 32%	15 30%
Totals		155 52%	154 51%	169 56%	140 47%	129 43%	42 14%	135 45%	171 57%	148 49%

Table 80. Frequency with Which Subjects Report Each of the Specified Properties as Being Characteristic of LSD.

		Improve Thinking	Relieve Tension Relax	Intensify Perceptions	Sharpen Religious Insight	Ease Depression	Satisfy Curiosity	Get High
H	M	29 58%	8 16%	37 74%	30 60%	8 16%	26 52%	29 58%
	F	29 58%	9 18%	44 88%	35 70%	6 12%	24 48%	25 50%
W	M	22 44%	8 16%	35 70%	33 66%	11 22%	26 52%	20 40%
	F	24 48%	11 22%	39 78%	29 58%	4 8%	32 64%	31 62%
U	M	16 32%	7 14%	39 78%	26 52%	9 18%	30 60%	25 50%
	F	19 38%	7 14%	39 78%	22 44%	5 10%	33 66%	22 44%
Totals		139 46%	50 17%	233 77%	175 58%	43 14%	171 57%	152 51%

		Deepen Self-Understanding	Facilitate Social Experience	Heighten Sexual Experience	For Kicks	Challenge Values of Society	Resolve Personal Problems	The "In" Thing To Do	Intensify Feelings	Increase Creativity
H	M	35 70%	17 34%	27 54%	26 52%	23 46%	13 26%	19 38%	27 54%	34 68%
	F	40 80%	11 22%	26 52%	19 38%	19 38%	12 24%	14 28%	35 70%	32 64%
W	M	34 68%	14 28%	24 48%	15 30%	20 40%	11 22%	15 30%	30 60%	27 54%
	F	38 76%	16 32%	21 42%	15 30%	18 36%	8 16%	13 26%	35 70%	29 58%
U	M	33 66%	15 30%	16 32%	29 58%	24 48%	8 16%	20 40%	25 50%	22 44%
	F	32 64%	12 24%	12 24%	27 54%	28 56%	14 28%	23 46%	33 66%	33 66%
Totals		212 71%	85 28%	126 42%	131 44%	132 44%	66 22%	104 35%	185 62%	177 59%

Table 81. Frequency with Which Subjects Report Each of the Specified Properties As Being Characteristic of Alcohol.

		Relieve Tension Relax	Ease Depres-sion	Sat-isfy Curi-osity	Get High	Facilitate Social Experience	Heighten Sexual Exper.	For Kicks	Challenge Values of Society	Resolve Personal Problems	The "In" Thing To Do
H	M	21 42%	19 38%	7 14%	29 58%	17 34%	5 10%	20 40%	5 10%	9 18%	17 34%
	F	33 66%	23 46%	10 20%	26 52%	14 28%	8 16%	24 48%	3 6%	9 18%	17 34%
W	M	29 58%	23 46%	16 32%	28 56%	19 38%	7 14%	18 36%	8 16%	9 18%	21 42%
	F	22 44%	16 32%	22 44%	34 68%	25 50%	15 30%	22 44%	8 16%	12 24%	15 30%
U	M	37 74%	29 58%	11 22%	39 78%	27 54%	9 18%	22 44%	3 6%	14 28%	20 40%
	F	38 76%	31 62%	12 24%	32 64%	30 60%	17 34%	18 36%	4 8%	13 26%	19 38%
Totals		180 60%	141 47%	78 26%	188 63%	132 44%	61 20%	124 41%	31 10%	66 22%	109 36%

Table 82. Frequency with Which Subjects Report Each of the Specified Properties as Being Characteristic of Heroin, Opium, Morphine, or Cocaine.

		Relieve Tension Relax	Intensify Perceptions	Ease Depression	Satisfy Curiosity	Get High	Facilitate Social Experience
H	M	22 44%	9 18%	18 36%	18 36%	30 60%	8 16%
	F	29 58%	4 8%	22 44%	16 32%	29 58%	4 8%
W	M	22 44%	6 12%	20 40%	24 48%	26 52%	9 18%
	F	17 34%	11 22%	11 22%	22 44%	30 60%	6 12%
U	M	24 48%	5 10%	22 44%	12 24%	28 56%	5 10%
	F	25 50%	8 16%	24 48%	19 38%	30 60%	7 14%
Totals		139 46%	43 14%	117 39%	111 37%	173 58%	39 13%

		Heighten Sexual Experience	For Kicks	Challenge Values of Society	Resolve Personal Problems	The "In" Thing To Do	Intensify Feelings
H	M	7 14%	23 46%	13 26%	15 30%	11 22%	10 20%
	F	10 20%	20 40%	8 16%	16 32%	9 18%	5 10%
W	M	8 16%	18 36%	15 30%	13 26%	10 20%	9 18%
	F	10 20%	18 36%	10 20%	12 24%	8 16%	13 26%
U	M	5 10%	25 50%	11 22%	13 26%	8 16%	2 4%
	F	9 18%	26 52%	13 26%	17 34%	9 18%	6 12%
Totals		49 16%	130 43%	70 23%	86 29%	55 18%	45 15%

Table 83. Frequency with Which Subjects Report Each of the Specified Properties as Being Characteristic of Anti-depressants.

		Improve Studying	Improve Thinking	Relieve Tension Relax	Intensify Perceptions	Ease Depression	Satisfy Curiosity	Get High
H	M	13 26%	8 16%	13 26%	8 16%	23 46%	11 22%	19 38%
	F	11 22%	5 10%	22 44%	3 6%	32 64%	8 16%	14 28%
W	M	15 30%	7 14%	12 24%	6 12%	30 60%	16 32%	14 28%
	F	9 18%	13 26%	21 42%	5 10%	28 56%	16 32%	16 32%
U	M	7 14%	9 18%	20 40%	3 6%	33 66%	10 20%	17 34%
	F	12 24%	8 16%	24 48%	4 8%	34 68%	9 18%	19 38%
Totals		67 22%	50 17%	112 37%	29 10%	180 60%	160 53%	99 33%

		Facilitate Social Experience	For Kicks	Stay Awake	Resolve Personal Problems	The "In" Thing To Do	Intensify Feelings
H	M	8 16%	13 26%	21 42%	9 18%	11 22%	5 10%
	F	8 16%	14 28%	9 18%	7 14%	5 10%	2 4%
W	M	11 22%	8 16%	13 26%	8 16%	6 12%	4 8%
	F	9 18%	14 28%	6 12%	8 16%	4 8%	4 8%
U	M	8 16%	13 26%	11 22%	7 14%	7 14%	3 6%
	F	8 16%	9 18%	14 28%	12 24%	3 6%	3 6%
Totals		52 17%	71 24%	74 25%	51 17%	36 12%	21 7%

Table 84. Frequency with Which Subjects Report Each of the Specified Properties as Being Characteristic of Tranquilizers.

		Improve Thinking	Relieve Tensions Relax	Ease Depression	Satisfy Curiosity	Get High	Facilitate Social Experience	For Kicks	Resolve Personal Problems	The "In" Thing To Do
H	M	11 22%	32 64%	13 26%	8 16%	16 32%	9 18%	12 24%	8 16%	12 24%
	F	3 6%	40 80%	21 42%	7 14%	12 24%	4 8%	11 22%	8 16%	5 10%
W	M	4 8%	28 56%	17 34%	18 36%	8 16%	4 8%	9 18%	5 10%	6 12%
	F	7 14%	28 56%	20 40%	16 32%	15 30%	8 16%	13 26%	8 16%	7 14%
U	M	8 16%	36 72%	23 46%	23 46%	13 26%	6 12%	10 20%	9 18%	8 16%
	F	7 14%	44 88%	29 58%	29 58%	4 8%	5 10%	3 6%	12 24%	3 6%
Totals		40 13%	208 69%	123 41%	101 34%	68 23%	36 12%	58 19%	50 17%	41 14%

Not only is there consistency among all respondents as to the properties of the various drugs, but there is also a marked ability to discriminate between drugs. This may be taken as evidence of a true "drug culture," in which those who are even minimally involved, in this instance, using marijuana only, are fully aware of the properties of virtually all of the substances available to the determined drug user. It would seem that these subjects are a discriminating audience in terms of knowledgeability about drug effects.

In terms of properties ascribed to specific drugs, inspection of Tables 77 through 84 shows the following:

1. Amphetamines: Drugs which are used primarily to stay awake and to improve studying. In addition, they are used for kicks, to get high, and to satisfy curiosity about their effects. They are not primarily seen as drugs which increase creativity, intensify feelings, are an expression of social revolt, are helpful in the resolution of personal problems, facilitate sexual or social experience, or intensify perceptions.

2. Barbiturates: Drugs which are used primarily to relieve tension. In addition, they are used for kicks, to get high, and to satisfy curiosity about their effects. They are not primarily seen as drugs which help to resolve personal problems, as an expression of social revolt, or as facilitators of social experience.

3. Marijuana, hashish: Drugs which are used primarily to to relieve tension, to intensify perceptions, to deepen self-awareness, to facilitate social and sexual experience, to intensify feelings, and to increase creativity. In addition, they are used to get high and for kicks, because smoking is considered the "in" thing to do, to satisfy curiosity, and to express social rebellion. They are not seen as a solution to personal problems or as a means to improve thinking. As so many positive effects are attributed to the drug, it is not surprising that marijuana seems to be the "drug of choice" among our study respondents.

4. LSD and other psychedelics: Drugs which are used primarily to increase creativity, intensify feelings, deepen self-understanding, intensify perceptions, sharpen religious thought, and improve thinking. In addition, they are used as an expression of social rebellion, as an expression of the "in" thing to do, for kicks, to get high, and to satisfy curiosity about their effects. They are not used primarily to ease depression,to relieve tension, or to solve personal problems. As with marijuana, it is clear that the various properties attributed to the drug make it attractive to the user.

5. Alcohol: Drug which is used primarily to relieve tension, to ease depression, and to facilitate social experience. It is also used to get high, for kicks, and as an expression of the "in" thing to do. It is particularly interesting that unlike marijuana its use is not seen as an expression of social rebellion, nor is it seen as a drug which has the myriad of other effects attributed to marijuana, e.g., intensification of feelings and perception, enhancement of creativity, etc. Moreover, even in terms of major effects attributed to alcohol, i.e., tension relief and social facilitation, more subjects attribute these effects to marijuana than to alcohol.

6. Heroin, opium, morphine, cocaine: Drugs which are used primarily to get high and for kicks. In addition, they are seen as drugs which relieve tension and ease depression. It is rather surprising to find that of all the drugs listed they are cited by more subjects than any other drug as helpful in the resolution of personal problems. They are not primarily used to intensify perception: or feelings, or to facilitate social or sexual experience.

7. Anti-depressants: Drugs which are used primarily to ease depression and to relieve tension. In addition they are used to get high and for kicks. They are not primarily used to intensify perceptions or feelings,

to resolve personal problems, to facilitate social experience, to improve thinking or studying.

8. Tranquilizers: Drug which are essentially used to relieve tension and to some extent depression. They are not used primarily for any other purpose.

Subjects were asked to identify those drugs which had given them "bad trips."

Table 85. Number and Percentage of Subjects Reporting "Bad Trips" from Each of the Specified Drugs.

		Marijuana	Hashish	Peyote (Mescalin)	LSD	Heroin	DMT DET STP	Barbiturates	Methadrine	Other Amphetamines	Opium/ Cocaine	Other
H	M	8 16%	5 10%	2 4%	14 28%	2 4%	2 4%	3 6%	2 4%	6 12%	1 2%	1 2%
	F	7 14%	6 12%	3 6%	11 22%	2 4%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%
W	M	6 12%	1 2%	2 4%	11 22%	3 6%	11 22%	5 10%	8 16%	6 12%	1 2%	1 2%
	F	6 12%	1 2%	1 2%	9 18%	2 4%	2 4%	2 4%	3 6%	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%
U	M	10 20%	6 12%	2 4%	7 14%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%
	F	9 18%	2 4%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Totals		46 15%	21 7%	11 4%	54 18%	10 3%	19 6%	12 4%	14 5%	19 6%	3 1%	3 1%

As may be seen from an inspection of Table 85, the greatest number of respondents report having had a "bad trip" from LSD, followed by marijuana. It is perhaps more meaningful to note that whereas 15% of all marijuana users have had "bad trips," 36% of all those reporting current or prior use of LSD report having had "bad trips" with the substance. Similarly, 17% of those who have taken methadrine or other amphetamines report having had "bad trips." Although the cell entries are too small to permit any meaningful application of the Chi Square analytic technique, a rough examination of the the cell entries indicates no particular pattern as a function of group membership.

Apparently, experience is a bad teacher - or perhaps the experience itself was not sufficiently bad. In any event, 60% of those reporting "bad trips" indicate that they would use the particular substance which had produced the "bad trip" again; as a matter of fact, 52% already had done so. The Chi Square values associated with these particular data are not significant - that is, distribution among the groups is approximately equal.

Presented below in Tables 86 through 90, are the numbers of respondents who report having terminated use of a particular drug, and the specified reasons for having done so.

Table 86. Reasons for Termination of Amphetamine Use.

		Bad Trip	Lost Interest	No Access to Supply	Influence of Parents	Influence of Friends	Fear of Dependence	Fear of Legal Action	Fear of Physical Damage	Fear of Genetic Damage	Other
H	M	7 14%	5 10%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	4 8%	1 2%	7 14%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	6 12%	9 18%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%	3 6%	0 0%	14 28%	1 2%	2 4%
W	M	6 12%	9 18%	3 6%	2 4%	0 0%	5 10%	1 2%	12 24%	3 6%	0 0%
	F	1 2%	8 16%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	5 10%	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%	1 2%
U	M	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	4 8%	3 6%	2 4%	2 4%	3 6%	2 4%	4 8%	2 4%	0 0%
Totals		20 6%	36 12%	10 3%	4 1%	7 2%	21 7%	5 2%	44 14%	7 2%	7 2%

Table 87. Reasons for Termination of Barbiturate Use.

		Bad Trip	Lost Interest	No Access to Supply	Influence of Parents	Influence of Friends	Fear of Dependence	Fear of Legal Action	Fear of Physical Damage	Fear of Genetic Damage	Other
H	M	3 6%	7 14%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	3 6%	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	6 12%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	4 8%	0 0%	3 6%
W	M	1 2%	7 14%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	10 20%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	1 2%	3 6%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
U	M	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%
Totals		6 2%	27 9%	4 1%	1 0%	4 1%	11 4%	1 0%	20 7%	1 0%	5 2%

Table 88. Reasons for Termination of Marijuana or Hashish Use.

		Bad Trip	Lost Interest	No Access to Supply	Influence of Parents	Influence of Friends	Fear of Dependence	Fear of Legal Action	Fear of Physical Damage	Fear of Genetic Damage	Other
H	M	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
W	M	0 0%	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%
U	M	1 2%	9 18%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	4 8%	0 0%	0 0%	5 10%
	F	1 2%	14 28%	5 10%	4 8%	7 14%	4 8%	3 6%	2 4%	3 6%	2 4%
Totals		4 1%	29 10%	9 3%	6 2%	10 3%	6 2%	8 3%	5 2%	4 1%	9 3%

Table 89. Reasons for Termination of LSD or Other Psychedelics Use.

		Bad Trip	Lost Interest	No Access to Supply	Influence of Parents	Influence of Friends	Fear of Dependence	Fear of Legal Action	Fear of Physical Damage	Fear of Genetic Damage	Other
H	M	6 12%	4 8%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	5 10%	5 10%	1 2%
	F	3 6%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	1 2%	2 4%
W	M	3 6%	6 12%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	8 16%	1 2%
	F	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	3 6%	3 6%	1 2%
U	M	1 2%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	2 4%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	1 2%	4 8%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%	4 8%	5 10%	1 2%
Totals		17 6%	18 6%	6 2%	0 0%	6 2%	2 1%	1 0%	18 6%	23 8%	9 3%

Table 90. Reasons for Termination of Heroin, Morphine, Opium or Cocaine Use.

		Bad Trip	Lost Interest	No Access to Supply	Influence of Parents	Influence of Friends	Fear of Dependence	Fear of Legal Action	Fear of Physical Damage	Fear of Genetic Damage	Other
H	M	3 6%	1 2%	3 6%	0 0%	1 2%	5 10%	0 0%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	0 0%	5 10%	5 10%	1 2%	2 4%	8 16%	0 0%	6 12%	0 0%	0 0%
W	M	3 6%	1 2%	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%	5 10%	0 0%	4 8%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	0 0%	4 8%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
U	M	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	2 4%
	F	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%
Totals		7 2%	12 4%	15 5%	3 1%	5 2%	25 8%	2 1%	18 6%	1 0%	3 1%

In reviewing the above Tables, none of which was subjected to any analysis due to the extremely small cell entries, it is interesting to note that the single most frequently given reason for having stopped various forms of drug use is "lost interest." That is, in the five tables above, 122 individuals report having terminated specific drug use because of a loss of interest. The next most frequently reported category is that of "fear of physical damage" (104 mentioned), followed by "bad trip" (54 mentioned).

Drug use, as has already been seen, is for many a question of satisfying curiosity about the drugs' effects. When this is a particularly strong motive, it seems likely that the drug activity will be dropped because of loss of interest. Fear of physical damage is apparently a deterrent for some people, in relation to those drugs for which there is evidence of damage. This makes it particularly important that the evidence, if it is genuine, be well publicized. Bad trips are apparently not a very strong deterrent as has already been discussed.

Subjects were asked to identify those drugs which they would not use agan. The responses to this question are tabulated below in Table 91.

Table 91. Frequency with Which Respondents Report that They Would Not Again Use Specific Drugs.

		Hashish	Peyote (Mescalin)	LSD	Heroin	DMT DET STP	Barbit-urates	Metha-drine	Other Amphet-amines	Opium/ Cocaine	Other
H	M	2 4%	3 6%	8 16%	8 16%	6 12%	4 8%	6 12%	6 12%	4 8%	0 0%
	F	2 4%	4 8%	4 8%	7 14%	4 8%	4 8%	7 14%	6 12%	1 2%	1 2%
W	M	1 2%	2 4%	4 8%	9 18%	4 8%	3 6%	10 20%	6 12%	3 6%	4 8%
	F	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	2 4%	0 0%	5 10%	4 8%	4 8%	3 6%	0 0%
U	M	0 0%	1 2%	4 8%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%	2 4%	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%
	F	3 6%	1 2%	4 8%	1 2%	4 8%	2 4%	3 6%	4 8%	2 4%	3 6%
Totals		8 3%	11 4%	28 9%	29 10%	18 6%	20 7%	32 11%	29 7%	14 5%	9 3%
Total Using /Previously Using (From Tables 43-54)		248	114	148	50	99	79	82	114	103	-
% of Previous Users No Longer Using		3%	9%	18%	58%	18%	25%	39%	25%	13%	-

As may be seen from an inspection of Table 91, by far the greatest single category of drugs that would not be used again are the amphetamines, including methadrine (a total of 61 individuals, or approximately 20% of the sample.) Approximately 10% also indicate that they would not use heroin, or LSD again. These data are perhaps more meaningful when compared with "usage" data, presented earlier. We find, in doing this, that the ratio of termination to use is highest for heroin, followed by methadrine, other amphetamines, and the barbiturates.

Subjects were asked why they had never used each of the drugs. By far the most popular response to this question is "not interested or curious." This is followed closely by a fear of possible physical or mental damage, or a fear of genetic damage to future children. With regard to heroin, opium, and cocaine, these reasons were complemented by a fear of dependence and/or addiction. It is again interesting to note how important the "interest" factor is with respect to initial drug selection and use, as well as to continued use.

Subjects were asked whether they intended to use any drugs they had not already tried. Responses to this question are presented in Table 92 below.

Table 92a. Reported Intentions to Use "New" Drugs.

		Yes	No
H	M	23 46%	25 50%
	F	31 62%	16 32%
W	M	27 54%	22 44%
	F	36 72%	11 22%
U	M	12 24%	34 68%
	F	7 14%	40 78%
Totals		136 45%	148 49%

Table 92b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Appplied to Data Presented Above in Table 92a.

		Yes	No
H	M	O = 23.00 E = 22.99	O = 25.00 E = 25.01
	F	O = 31.00 E = 22.51	O = 16.00 E = 24.49
W	M	O = 27.00 E = 23.46	O = 22.00 E = 25.54
	F	O = 36.00 E = 22.51	O = 11.00 E = 24.49
U	M	O = 12.00 E = 22.03	O = 34.00 E = 23.97
	F	O = 7.00 E = 22.51	O = 40.00 E = 24.49

Chi Square : 51.9563 for 5 d.f.
p<.001

As will be noted, almost half of the subjects indicate that they do intend to try drugs that are "new" to them. As might be expected in the light of previous data, the significant Chi Square value reflects the greater than expected frequency of those among the hippies and weekenders who plan to use additional drugs, complemented by the lower than expected frequency among the users, only one-fifth of whom plan to try "new" drugs. In terms of the drugs which subjects intend to try, the most popular is peyote (N=42), followed by LSD (N=27), opium and/or cocain (N=23), DMT, DET, STP (N=14) and heroin (N=12). The figure of four percent of the sample who express the intention to try heroin is consistent with the impression of many that heroin use is becoming more acceptable to middle class adolescents.

SUMMARY

The major findings reported in this section can be summarized as follows:

1) The hippies use more drugs than any other group, followed by the weekenders, and trailed by the users. The latter use primarily marijuana and hashish; relatively few of them are involved with any other drugs. It is important to note that the user group has been involved with marijuana for three years, yet they have by and large not gone on to other drug use.

2) Drug use is primarily a peer group phenomenon. Most drug users of all kinds are initiated into drug use by their close friends, they use marijuana in small groups of friends. The popular image of the marijuana user as a pusher of drugs onto the uninitiated is not supported by these data. Most drug users learn about drugs from their friends, and the opinions of their friends are more important to them than the opinions of anyone else. Most of a drug user's friends are not anti-drug.

3) Only ten percent of subjects report feeling "miserable" just prior ot their initiation into drug use. Another 45% state that they had some problem(s) at this time. The hippies and weekenders are more likely to see themselves as having problems than are the users. The overall impression is that the majority of drug users do not turn to drugs because of feelings of despair and misery.

4) Among subjects who acknowledge problems prior to initial drug use, the most commonly reported problems are: feelings of detachment from society, lack of meaningfulness, lack of direction, and lack of attachment to one person. Feelings of sadness or tension, inability to get along with family, and problems in school are prevalent. These problems are common to all drug users, i.e., no problem is specific to a particular group.

5) The majority of drug users report that their first drug experience, which is most typically with marijuana, was a pleasurable one.

6) All drug users, whether they use a particular substance or not, show high agreement regarding the properties they attribute to the substance. In addition, they are well aware of differences between various substances. Marijuana and hashish are ascribed more positivie attributes by more people than any other drug, including alcohol.

7) Bad trips are reported by 15% of marijuana users, and by 36% of LSD users. However, bad trips do not seem to be a very important deterrent in terms of further use. The most frequent reasons given for termination of use are "loss of interest" and "fear of physical damage." Since many drug users state that they try a particular drug out of curiosity about its effects, it seems that many terminate use once this curiosity has been satisfied. It seems also that in the case of those drugs where the possibility of physical damage has been clearly established and well publicized, fear of damage acts as a deterrent for some users.

ALIENATION

C. Alienation:

Alienation can be defined as a loss or a lack of relationship with the people, institutions, or values of the external society where some form of relationship is to be expected. With this in mind, what follows is a discussion of three major general areas of relatedness: family and friends, existing social institutions, and traditionally valued concepts such as work, future planning, etc. In other words, what follows is a discussion of alienation from three major mainstreams of everyday life.

1. Family and Friends:

Subjects were asked to characterize their relationships with their mothers in terms of amicability. Data bearing on this issue are presented below in Table 93.

Table 93a. Mean Scores in Terms of Reported Amicability of Relationship with Mother (1 = extremely amicable).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	50	2.820	1.519
	2 Weekenders	49	3.143	1.212
	3 Users	47	2.745	1.328
	4 Non Users	49	2.714	1.161
Females	5 Hippies	49	3.490	1.500
	6 Weekenders	50	3.180	1.465
	7 Users	48	2.917	1.605
	8 Non Users	50	2.160	1.362

Table 93b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 93a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	824.712	391			
Treat	54.384	7	7.769	3.873	
Factor 1	34.942	3	11.647	5.806	.01
Factor 2	.590	1	.590	.294	NS
1 Times 2	18.852	3	6.284	3.133	.05
Resid.	770.328	384	2.006		

Table 93c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 93a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 5 - Mean 8	1.330*	.647
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.776*	.640
Mean 5 - Mean 3	.745*	.630
Mean 5 - Mean 1	.670*	.619
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.573	.604
Mean 5 - Mean 2	.347	.584
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.310	.555
Mean 6 - Mean 8	1.020*	.640
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.466	.630
Mean 6 - Mean 3	.435	.619
Mean 6 - Mean 1	.360	.604
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.263	.584
Mean 6 - Mean 2	.037	.555
Mean 2 - Mean 8	.983*	.630
Mean 2 - Mean 4	.429	.619
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.398	.604
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.323	.584
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.226	.555
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.757*	.619
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.203	.604
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.172	.584
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.097	.555
Mean 1 - Mean 8	.660*	.604
Mean 1 - Mean 4	.106	.584
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.075	.555
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.585*	.584
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.031	.555
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.554	.555

As will be noted from an examination of the above tables, significant differences do occur among groups, as does a significant interaction effect between factor I (groups, i.e., hippie, weekender, user, and non user) and factor II (sex). The differences in groups stem from the less amicable feelings of all of the weekenders, female hippies and female users toward their mothers. The interaction effect arises from just this greater degree of hostility manifested by the female groups to their mothers. The only noteworthy exception is the non-user females, who see themselves as significantly closer to their mothers than does any other group. In fact, this is the only group whose mean scale position is in the "very amicable" category. The mean scale position of all of the other female groups and of the male weekenders tends to lie between the "somewhat amicable" and "neither amicable nor hostile" categories. Thus, the self-perceived relationship between these subjects and their mothers tends to be neither amicable nor hostile; rather it can be characterized as one of neutrality.

Subjects were also asked to characterize their relationships with their mothers in terms of the degree of attachment. They were asked to rate the degree of their attachment on a seven point scale ranging from "very strong attachment" to "complete detachment." The analyses of these data are presented in Table 94 below.

Table 94a. Mean Scores in Terms of Reported Attachment of All Subjects to Their Mothers (1 = very strong attachment).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	2.204	2.030
	2 Weekenders	50	3.400	1.855
	3 Users	49	2.857	1.654
	4 Non Users	49	2.653	1.333
Females	5 Hippies	50	3.320	2.034
	6 Weekenders	48	2.833	1.650
	7 Users	50	2.840	1.736
	8 Non Users	47	1.979	1.246

Table 94b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 94a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	1225.500	391			
Treat	69.193	7	9.885	3.283	
Factor 1	50.081	3	16.694	5.544	.01
Factor 2	7.498	1	7.498	2.490	NS
1 Times 2	11.614	3	3.871	1.286	NS
Resid.	1156.307	384	3.011		

Table 94c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 94a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 2 - Mean 8	1.421*	.793
Mean 2 - Mean 4	.747	.784
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.567	.772
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.560	.758
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.543	.740
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.196	.716
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.080	.680
Mean 5 - Mean 8	1.341*	.784
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.667	.772
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.487	.758
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.480	.740
Mean 5 - Mean 3	.463	.716
Mean 5 - Mean 1	.116	.680
Mean 1 - Mean 8	1.225*	.772
Mean 1 - Mean 4	.551	.758
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.371	.740
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.364	.716
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.347	.680
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.878*	.758
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.204	.740
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.024	.716
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.017	.680
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.861*	.740
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.187	.716
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.007	.680
Mean 6 - Mean 8	.854*	.716
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.180	.680
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.674	.680

It appears that the only significant difference along this dimension is between the female non users and all other groups. The female non users tend to report either "very strong" or "considerable" attachment. All other groups tend toward a mean score in the "mild attachment" category. It is noteworthy, however, that among the hippie groups, 45% of the subjects report either "very strong" or "considerable" attachment to their mothers.

It seems that the popular image of the adolescent running away from home in hatred and anger to become a hippie, is not supported by the data.

In terms of their relatiionship with their fathers, subjects were asked to characterize this relationship in terms or amicability. These data are presented below in Table 95.

Table 95a. Mean Scores in Terms of Reported Amicability of Relationship with Father (1 = extremely amicable).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	48	3.125	1.495
	2 Weekenders	48	3.500	1.190
	3 Users	47	2.872	1.525
	4 Non Users	46	2.761	1.492
Females	5 Hippies	49	3.163	1.267
	6 Weekenders	50	3.120	1.608
	7 Users	48	2.896	1.558
	8 Non Users	49	2.122	1.154

Table 95b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 95a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Sqaure	F	Significance Level
Total	831.855	384			
Treat	55.283	7	7.898	3.834	
Factor 1	42.027	3	14.009	6.801	.01
Factor 2	5.647	1	5.647	2.741	NS
1 Times 2	7.609	3	2.536	1.231	NS
Resid.	776.572	377	2.060		

Table 95c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 95a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 2 - Mean 8	1.378*	.656
Mean 2 - Mean 4	.739*	.648
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.628	.639
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.604	.627
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.380	.612
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.375	.592
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.337	.563
Mean 5 - Mean 8	1.041*	.648
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.402	.639
Mean 5 - Mean 3	.291	.627
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.267	.612
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.043	.592
Mean 5 - Mean 1	.038	.563
Mean 1 - Mean 8	1.003*	.639
Mean 1 - Mean 4	.364	.627
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.253	.612
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.229	.592
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.055	.563
Mean 6 - Mean 8	.998*	.627
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.359	.612
Mean 6 - Mean 3	.248	.592
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.224	.563
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.774*	.612
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.135	.592
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.024	.563
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.750*	.592
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.111	.563
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.639*	.563

It is readily apparent that the non-user females are again significantly different from all other groups. That is, they tend to characterize this relationship as "extremely" or "very amicable." The male weekenders tend to have the most neutral relationship with their fathers and there is a significant difference between them and the male non users who tend to describe the relationship in more positive terms.

Subjects were asked to rate the degree of their attachment to their fathers. The results of the analyses of these data are presented below in Table 96.

Table 96a. Mean Scores in Terms of Reported Attachment of Subjects to Their Fathers (1 = very strong attachment).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	48	4.333	2.435
	2 Weekenders	50	4.100	2.220
	3 Users	48	3.450	2.236
	4 Non Users	50	2.940	1.848
Females	5 Hippies	50	3.480	1.910
	6 Weekenders	49	3.510	2.205
	7 Users	50	3.080	2.115
	8 Non Users	48	2.521	1.904

Table 96b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 96a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	1880.183	392			
Treat	119.896	7	17.128	3.746	
Factor 1	85.646	3	28.549	6.244	.01
Factor 2	29.915	1	29.915	6.543	.01
1 Times 2	4.335	3	1.445	.316	NS
Resid.	1760.287	385	4.572		

Table 96c. Duncan Multiple Range Test of Data Presented in Table 96a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 1 - Mean 8	1.812*	.977
Mean 1 - Mean 4	1.393*	.966
Mean 1 - Mean 7	1.253*	.951
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.875	.934
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.853	.912
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.823	.882
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.233	.838
Mean 2 - Mean 8	1.579*	.966
Mean 2 - Mean 4	1.160*	.951
Mean 2 - Mean 7	1.020*	.934
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.642	.912
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.620	.882
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.590	.838
Mean 6 - Mean 8	.989*	.951
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.570	.934
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.430	.912
Mean 6 - Mean 3	.052	.882
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.030	.838
Mean 5 - Mean 8	.959*	.934
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.540	.912
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.400	.882
Mean 5 - Mean 3	.022	.838
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.937*	.912
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.518	.882
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.378	.838
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.559	.882
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.140	.838
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.419	.838

Essentially, the males in both hippie groups perceive their relationships with their fathers in terms of "detachment." They differ significantly from the male and female non users and from the female users. The female non users are significantly more attached to their fathers than are the male users, and the female hippies and weekenders.

Respondents were asked whether they feel like an "outsider" or an "insider" to their parental families. The data reflecting answers to this question are presented below in Table 97.

Table 97a. Number of Subjects Reporting that They Are Outsiders, or Insiders, to Their Parental Family.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	22 44%	20 40%
	F	21 42%	19 38%
W	M	25 50%	20 40%
	F	26 52%	22 44%
U	M	18 36%	28 56%
	F	12 24%	35 70%
NU	M	8 16%	40 80%
	F	5 10%	43 86%
Totals		137 34%	227 57%

Table 97b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 97a.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	O = 22.00 E = 15.81	O = 20.00 E = 26.19
	F	O = 21.00 E = 15.05	O = 19.00 E = 24.95
W	M	O = 25.00 E = 16.94	O = 20.00 E = 28.06
	F	O = 26.00 E = 18.07	O = 22.00 E = 29.93
U	M	O = 18.00 E = 17.31	O = 28.00 E = 28.69
	F	O = 12.00 E = 17.69	O = 35.00 E = 29.31
NU	M	O = 8.00 E = 18.07	O = 40.00 E = 29.93
	F	O = 5.00 E = 18.07	O = 43.00 E = 29.93

Chi Square = 46.5213 for 7 d.f.
$p<.001$

As will be noted from an examination of Table 97, many more of the hippies and weekenders than would be expected report feelings of being an outsider to their parental families. This is consistent with the finding that their relationships with their families are characterized not by hostility, but rather in terms of detachment. At least in terms of conscious experience, the hippie groups feel not hostility, but a lack of relatedness to their parental families. These data lend support to the alienation hypothesis.

More of the non users and the female users than would be expected report feeling like insiders to their parental families. It is interesting to note that the female users, who have already been characterized as a group of very casual users who are not extensively or intensively involved with drugs, show the same response pattern as the non users. The male users who are more involved in all aspects of drug use, tend to be somewhere between the hippie groups and the non-user groups in terms of the number reporting that they feel like insiders or outsiders vis-a-vis their families.

It is also interesting that while the feeling of being an outsider is more characteristic of the hippie groups, over one-third of all subjects in the aggregate feel like outsiders to their parental families. Even among the non users, 13% report feeling like outsiders.

Turning from the issue of relationships with parents to relationships with friends, subjects were asked to report on the duration of their closest friendship. It had been predicted that the hippies would manifest their reputed deficit in object relations by an inability to establish and maintain long-term relationships. These data are presented below in Table 98.

Table 98a. Length of "Best Friend" Relationships Reported Among Subjects.

		Less Than A Month	1-3 Months	3-6 Months	6 Months-1 Year	1-2 Years	2-4 Years	Over 4 Years	None
H	M	0 0%	0 0%	4 8%	5 10%	7 14%	4 8%	12 24%	15 30%
	F	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	9 18%	7 14%	7 14%	15 30%	12 24%
W	M	1 2%	2 4%	2 4%	6 12%	11 22%	7 14%	6 12%	15 30%
	F	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	8 16%	12 24%	7 14%	7 14%	13 26%
U	M	0 0%	2 4%	2 4%	3 6%	7 14%	10 20%	16 32%	9 18%
	F	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	6 12%	7 14%	12 24%	20 40%	4 8%
NU	M	0 0%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	9 18%	7 14%	23 46%	6 12%
	F	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	8 16%	7 14%	24 48%	7 14%
Totals		2 1%	7 2%	12 3%	40 10%	68 17%	61 15%	123 31%	81 20%

Table 98b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 98a.

		Less Than A Year	More Than A Year	No Best Friend
H	M	O = 9.00 E = 7.38	O = 23.00 E = 29.98	O = 15.00 E = 9.64
	F	O = 9.00 E = 7.85	O = 29.00 E = 31.90	O = 12.00 E = 10.25
W	M	O = 11.00 E = 7.85	O = 24.00 E = 31.90	O = 15.00 E = 10.25
	F	O = 11.00 E = 7.85	O = 26.00 E = 31.90	O = 13.00 E = 10.25
U	M	O = 7.00 E = 7.69	O = 33.00 E = 31.26	O = 9.00 E = 10.05
	F	O = 7.00 E = 7.85	O = 39.00 E = 31.90	O = 4.00 E = 10.25
NU	M	O = 4.00 E = 7.69	O = 39.00 E = 31.26	O = 6.00 E = 10.05
	F	O = 4.00 E = 7.85	O = 39.00 E = 31.90	O = 7.00 E = 10.25

Chi Square = 29.7817 for 14 d.f.
$p < .01$

The most striking aspect of the findings presented immediately above is the relatively large number of subjects in the hippie groups who report that they have no best friend. Hence, there does seem to be some difference between the groups in terms of their ability to establish long-term close relationships.

Subjects were asked to describe the qualities which they value most highly in a friend. In all groups those qualities which are most valued in a friend are honesty and loyalty (40%), character and warmth (18%), and compatibility and mutual interests (16%). All other qualities,e.g., concern for others, humor, political awareness, rebelliousness, creativity, are mentioned by only about one subject out of 20. Again, there are no differences among the groups. One interesting finding is that only .5% of all subjects (zero percent among the hippies and two percent among the week-enders) mention "hippieness" and/or drug use as something to be looked for in a friend. Thus, in terms of qualities valued in a friend, there is a very great uniformity among all groups. The notion that friendships among hippies revolve about drug use for want of other topics, is not borne out by the data.

While many in the hippie groups report that they do not have long standing relationships with others, i.e., they do not have a best friend, they do report an incredible number of friendships.

The data and analyses pertaining to the question, "How many close friends do you currently have" are presented in Table 99 below.

Table 99a. Mean Number of Current Close Friends Reported by All Groups.

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	43	86.233	251.053
	2 Weekenders	37	117.892	307.247
	3 Users	46	9.239	8.886
	4 Non Users	45	8.200	8.418
Females	5 Hippies	46	53.457	201.971
	6 Weekenders	46	53.783	202.165
	7 Users	50	5.040	4.720
	8 Non Users	50	6.020	4.743

Table 99b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 99a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	10509832.203	362			
Treat	541257.426	7	77322.489	2.754	
Factor 1	432567.335	3	144189.111	5.135	NS
Factor 2	48947.992	1	48947.992	1.743	NS
1 Times 2	59742.093	3	19914.031	.709	NS
Resid.	9968575.239	355	28080.493		

Although these data must be interpreted with caution because of the highly skewed nature of the distribution, nevertheless it is striking that the hippie males report a mean number of 86 friends the male weekenders report a mean number of 117 friends, and the female hippies and weekenders report a mean number of 53 friends. In sharp contrast, the user and non-user groups report a mean number of friends which ranges from five to nine. Since it seems highly

unlikely that anyone can establish and maintain close relationships with even 53 people, it seems likely that the quality of these relationships must be highly superficial. The lack of long-standing close relationships and the large number of people regarded as friends lends support to the notion of a deficit in object relationships among hippie group members. Perhaps superficial ersatz relationships with many are formed as a substitute for stable and intense close friendships with a few. The feelings of detachment from the family, the general picture of family tension in terms of broken families, frequency of arguments, and lack of family closeness discussed in Section A of this report, may be the underlying cause of the inability of many of the hippie subjects to establish and maintain close interpersonal ties.

2. Alienation From Existing Social Institutions:

Subjects were asked whether or not they feel alienated from society, in terms of degree of agreement or disagreement manifested to the statement: "I would consider myself alienated from contemporary society." The analyses of the responses to this question are presented in Table 100 below.

Table 100a. Mean Scores for Subjects in All Groups on Agreement with the Statement "I feel alienated from society." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	2.041	1.195
	2 Weekenders	50	1.840	.833
	3 Users	49	2.837	1.375
	4 Non Users	49	3.633	.897
Females	5 Hippies	48	1.833	.986
	6 Weekenders	48	1.604	.810
	7 Users	49	2.959	1.087
	8 Non Users	49	3.551	1.070

Table 100b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 100a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	653.136	390			
Treat.	224.229	7	32.033	28.604	
Factor 1	221.292	3	73.764	65.869	.01
Factor 2	.773	1	.773	.690	NS
1 Times 2	2.164	3	.721	.644	NS
Resid.	428.907	383	1.120		

Table 100c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented In Table 100a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 6	2.029*	.619
Mean 4 - Mean 5	1.800*	.612
Mean 4 - Mean 2	1.793*	.605
Mean 4 - Mean 1	1.592*	.595
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.796*	.584
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.674*	.568
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.082	.545
Mean 8 - Mean 6	1.947*	.612
Mean 8 - Mean 5	1.718*	.605
Mean 8 - Mean 2	1.711*	.595
Mean 8 - Mean 1	1.510*	.584
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.714*	.568
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.592*	.545
Mean 7 - Mean 6	1.355*	.605
Mean 7 - Mean 5	1.126*	.595
Mean 7 - Mean 2	1.119*	.584
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.918*	.568
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.122	.545
Mean 3 - Mean 6	1.233*	.595
Mean 3 - Mean 5	1.004*	.584
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.997*	.568
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.796*	.545
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.437	.584
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.208	.568
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.201	.545
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.236	.568
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.007	.545
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.229	.545

Among the hippies and the weekenders there are no significant differences; the average responses fall between "strongly agree" and "agree." Among the most"engaged" group, i.e., the non users, the average responses fall between "uncertain" and "disagree." Their overall position appears to be one of disagreement with the statement. The users' responses tend to fall between the "agree" and "uncertain" scale positions. Their overall position appears

to be one of uncertainty. Thus, it can be said that the hippie groups (78% of hippies, 85% of weekenders) are the only ones in which a vast majority of respondents characterize themselves as alienated from society.

Subjects were asked to characterize themselves as insiders or outsiders vis-a-vis middle class institutions, the age of technology, western culture, and being an American. The results of the analyses of responses to these questions are shown below, in Tables 101 through 104.

Table 101a. Subjects Reports of Feeling Like an Outsider, or an Insider Vis-a-Vis Middle Class Institutions.

		Outsider	Insider	Outsider /Insider	Not Applicable
H	M	37 74%	6 12%	1 2%	4 8%
	F	39 78%	4 8%	0 0%	2 4%
W	M	44 88%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%
	F	43 86%	4 8%	1 2%	2 4%
U	M	26 52%	20 40%	0 0%	2 4%
	F	30 60%	14 28%	1 2%	2 4%
NU	M	18 36%	28 56%	0 0%	3 6%
	F	18 36%	29 58%	0 0%	2 4%
Totals		255 64%	107 27%	3 1%	19 5%

Table 101b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 101a.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	O = 37.00 E = 30.74	O = 7.00 E = 13.26
	F	O = 39.00 E = 30.04	O = 4.00 E = 12.96
W	M	O = 44.00 E = 32.84	O = 3.00 E 14.16
	F	O = 43.00 E = 33.53	O = 5.00 E = 14.47
U	M	O = 26.00 E = 32.14	O = 20.00 E = 13.86
	F	O = 30.00 E = 30.74	O = 14.00 E = 13.26
NU	M	O = 18.00 E = 32.14	O = 28.00 E = 13.86
	F	O = 18.00 E = 32.84	O = 29.00 E = 14.16

Chi Square = 81.3820 for 7 d.f.
p<.001

Table 102a. Subjects Reports of Feeling Like an Outsider, or an Insider Vis-a-Vis the Age of Technology.

		Outsider	Insider	Outsider /Insider	Not Applicable
H	M	28 56%	16 32%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	30 60%	14 28%	0 0%	3 6%
W	M	23 46%	21 42%	1 2%	4 8%
	F	29 58%	11 22%	0 0%	5 10%
U	M	17 34%	27 54%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	24 48%	19 38%	1 2%	4 8%
NU	M	16 32%	27 54%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	16 32%	29 58%	0 0%	3 6%
Totals		183 46%	164 41%	5 1%	28 7%

Table 102b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented in Table 102a.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	O = 28.00 E = 23.20	O = 16.00 E = 20.80
	F	O = 30.00 E = 23.20	O = 14.00 E = 20.80
W	M	O = 23.00 E = 23.20	O = 21.00 E = 20.80
	F	O = 29.00 E = 21.10	O = 11.00 E = 18.90
U	M	O = 17.00 E = 23.20	O = 27.00 E = 20.80
	F	O = 24.00 E = 22.68	O = 19.00 E = 20.32
NU	M	O = 16.00 E = 22.68	O = 27.00 E = 20.32
	F	O = 16.00 E = 23.73	O = 29.00 E = 21.27

Chi Square = 25.7423 for 7 d.f.
p<.001

Table 103a. Subjects Reports of Feeling Like an Outsider, or an Insider Vis-a-Vis Western Culture.

		Outsider	Insider	Outsider /Insider	Not Applicable
H	M	20 40%	23 46%	1 2%	5 10%
	F	22 44%	18 36%	1 2%	3 6%
W	M	26 52%	18 36%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	28 56%	16 32%	0 0%	4 8%
U	M	13 26%	34 68%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	7 14%	34 68%	1 2%	6 12%
NU	M	14 28%	29 58%	1 2%	5 10%
	F	8 16%	33 66%	1 2%	7 14%
Totals		138 35%	205 51%	6 2%	34 9%

Table 103b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 103a.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	O = 20.00 E = 17.30	O = 23.00 E = 25.70
	F	O = 22.00 E = 16.09	O = 18.00 E = 23.91
W	M	O = 26.00 E = 17.70	O = 18.00 E = 26.30
	F	O = 28.00 E = 17.70	O = 16.00 E = 26.30
U	M	O = 13.00 E = 18.91	O = 34.00 E = 28.09
	F	O = 7.00 E = 16.50	O = 34.00 E = 24.50
NU	M	O = 14.00 E = 17.30	O = 29.00 E = 25.70
	F	O = 8.00 E = 16.50	O = 33.00 E = 24.50

Chi Square = 41.4714 for 7 d.f.
p< .001

Table 104a. Subjects Reports of Feeling Like an Outsider, or an Insider, Vis-aVis Being an American.

		Outsider	Insider	Outsider /Insider	Not Applicable
H	M	30 60%	10 20%	1 2%	7 14%
	F	32 64%	10 20%	0 0%	4 8%
W	M	35 70%	10 20%	0 0%	4 8%
	F	36 72%	11 22%	0 0%	2 4%
U	M	22 44%	25 50%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	11 22%	35 70%	0 0%	1 2%
NU	M	6 12%	39 78%	0 0%	3 6%
	F	8 16%	38 76%	0 0%	3 6%
Totals		180 45%	178 45%	1 0%	25 6%

Table 104b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 104a.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	O = 30.00 E = 20.11	O = 10.00 E = 19.89
	F	O = 32.00 E = 21.12	O = 10.00 E = 20.88
W	M	O = 35.00 E = 22.63	O = 10.00 E = 22.37
	F	O = 36.00 E = 23.63	O = 11.00 E = 23.37
U	M	O = 22.00 E = 23.63	O = 25.00 E = 23.37
	F	O = 11.00 E = 23.13	O = 35.00 E = 22.87
NU	M	O = 6.00 E = 22.63	O = 39.00 E = 22.37
	F	O = 8.00 E = 23.13	O = 38.00 E = 22.87

Chi Square = 105.1811 for 7 d.f.
p<.001

As will be noted from an inspection of the above tables, in which all of the Chi Square values are significant, there is the very definite tendency for hippies to see themselves as alienated from middle class society, from the age of technology, from western culture, and from "being an American." The item which discriminates best among the hippie groups and the non-hippie groups seems to be the one which concerns being an American. Over two-thirds of the hippies characterize themselves as outsiders; less than one-fourth of the non users and of the female users see themselves in this way. The male users, as has so often been the case, fall between these two categories and almost one-half of them report feeling like an outsider.

It should be noted that over 60% of all subjects see themselves as outsiders vis-a-vis traditional middle class institutions (including 56% of users and 36% of non users); that almost half of all respondents see themselves as outsiders to the age of technology (including 41% of users and 32% of non users). It seems that although differences between the groups are significant, there is a widespread feeling of alienation among contemporary youth. These data suggest that a large proportion of the total sample see themselves as alienated from certain social institutions. The "flight to hippiedom" may be seen not so much as a determinant of behavior, or a discriminator among groups which are markedly different in all

areas, but rather as one form of reaction which may be taken to a dissatisfying environment. Our data suggest that those who become hippies have a history of self-perceived detachment from family and peers which antedates their alienation from society.

The pattern of widespread disaffection with, or alienation from, the United States Government can be clearly seen from the analyses of subjects' agreement or disagreement, on a five point scale, with a number of statements about the government and the country.

First subjects were asked to respond to the statement: "In government today there is no one you can really trust." The analyses pertaining to the responses to this question are presented in Table 105 below.

Table 105a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "In government today there is no one you can really trust." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	50	2.020	1.049
	2 Weekenders	50	1.980	1.068
	3 Users	49	2.898	1.147
	4 Non Users	49	3.429	1.161
Females	5 Hippies	48	1.687	.982
	6 Weekenders	49	1.755	.937
	7 Users	50	2.500	1.082
	8 Non Users	50	2.860	1.114

Table 105b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 105a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	588.177	394			
Treat	135.834	7	19.405	16.602	
Factor 1	119.955	3	39.985	34.209	.01
Factor 2	13.347	1	13.347	11.419	.01
1 Times 2	2.532	3	.844	.722	NS
Resid.	452.344	387	1.169		

Table 100c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented In Table 100a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 6	2.029*	.619
Mean 4 - Mean 5	1.800*	.612
Mean 4 - Mean 2	1.793*	.605
Mean 4 - Mean 1	1.592*	.595
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.796*	.584
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.674*	.568
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.082	.545
Mean 8 - Mean 6	1.947*	.612
Mean 8 - Mean 5	1.718*	.605
Mean 8 - Mean 2	1.711*	.595
Mean 8 - Mean 1	1.510*	.584
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.714*	.568
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.592*	.545
Mean 7 - Mean 6	1.355*	.605
Mean 7 - Mean 5	1.126*	.595
Mean 7 - Mean 2	1.119*	.584
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.918*	.568
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.122	.545
Mean 3 - Mean 6	1.233*	.595
Mean 3 - Mean 5	1.004*	.584
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.997*	.568
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.796*	.545
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.437	.584
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.208	.568
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.201	.545
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.236	.568
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.007	.545
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.229	.545

Among the hippies and the weekenders there are no significant differences; the average responses fall between "strongly agree" and "agree." Among the most"engaged" group, i.e., the non users, the average responses fall between "uncertain" and "disagree." Their overall position appears to be one of disagreement with the statement. The users' responses tend to fall between the "agree" and "uncertain" scale positions. Their overall position appears

to be one of uncertainty. Thus, it can be said that the hippie groups (78% of hippies, 85% of weekenders) are the only ones in which a vast majority of respondents characterize themselves as alienated from society.

Subjects were asked to characterize themselves as insiders or outsiders vis-a-vis middle class institutions, the age of technology, western culture, and being an American. The results of the analyses of responses to these questions are shown below, in Tables 101 through 104.

Table 101a. Subjects Reports of Feeling Like an Outsider, or an Insider Vis-a-Vis Middle Class Institutions.

		Outsider	Insider	Outsider /Insider	Not Applicable
H	M	37 74%	6 12%	1 2%	4 8%
	F	39 78%	4 8%	0 0%	2 4%
W	M	44 88%	2 4%	0 0%	2 4%
	F	43 86%	4 8%	1 2%	2 4%
U	M	26 52%	20 40%	0 0%	2 4%
	F	30 60%	14 28%	1 2%	2 4%
NU	M	18 36%	28 56%	0 0%	3 6%
	F	18 36%	29 58%	0 0%	2 4%
Totals		255 64%	107 27%	3 1%	19 5%

Table 101b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 101a.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	O = 37.00 E = 30.74	O = 7.00 E = 13.26
	F	O = 39.00 E = 30.04	O = 4.00 E = 12.96
W	M	O = 44.00 E = 32.84	O = 3.00 E 14.16
	F	O = 43.00 E = 33.53	O = 5.00 E = 14.47
U	M	O = 26.00 E = 32.14	O = 20.00 E = 13.86
	F	O = 30.00 E = 30.74	O = 14.00 E = 13.26
NU	M	O = 18.00 E = 32.14	O = 28.00 E = 13.86
	F	O = 18.00 E = 32.84	O = 29.00 E = 14.16

Chi Square = 81.3820 for 7 d.f.
p<.001

Table 102a. Subjects Reports of Feeling Like an Outsider, or an Insider Vis-a-Vis the Age of Technology.

		Outsider	Insider	Outsider /Insider	Not Applicable
H	M	28 56%	16 32%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	30 60%	14 28%	0 0%	3 6%
W	M	23 46%	21 42%	1 2%	4 8%
	F	29 58%	11 22%	0 0%	5 10%
U	M	17 34%	27 54%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	24 48%	19 38%	1 2%	4 8%
NU	M	16 32%	27 54%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	16 32%	29 58%	0 0%	3 6%
Totals		183 46%	164 41%	5 1%	28 7%

Table 102b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented in Table 102a.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	O = 28.00 E = 23.20	O = 16.00 E = 20.80
	F	O = 30.00 E = 23.20	O = 14.00 E = 20.80
W	M	O = 23.00 E = 23.20	O = 21.00 E = 20.80
	F	O = 29.00 E = 21.10	O = 11.00 E = 18.90
U	M	O = 17.00 E = 23.20	O = 27.00 E = 20.80
	F	O = 24.00 E = 22.68	O = 19.00 E = 20.32
NU	M	O = 16.00 E = 22.68	O = 27.00 E = 20.32
	F	O = 16.00 E = 23.73	O = 29.00 E = 21.27

Chi Square = 25.7423 for 7 d.f.
p<.001

Table 103a. Subjects Reports of Feeling Like an Outsider, or an Insider Vis-a-Vis Western Culture.

		Outsider	Insider	Outsider /Insider	Not Applicable
H	M	20 40%	23 46%	1 2%	5 10%
	F	22 44%	18 36%	1 2%	3 6%
W	M	26 52%	18 36%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	28 56%	16 32%	0 0%	4 8%
U	M	13 26%	34 68%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	7 14%	34 68%	1 2%	6 12%
NU	M	14 28%	29 58%	1 2%	5 10%
	F	8 16%	33 66%	1 2%	7 14%
Totals		138 35%	205 51%	6 2%	34 9%

Table 103b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 103a.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	O = 20.00 E = 17.30	O = 23.00 E = 25.70
	F	O = 22.00 E = 16.09	O = 18.00 E = 23.91
W	M	O = 26.00 E = 17.70	O = 18.00 E = 26.30
	F	O = 28.00 E = 17.70	O = 16.00 E = 26.30
U	M	O = 13.00 E = 18.91	O = 34.00 E = 28.09
	F	O = 7.00 E = 16.50	O = 34.00 E = 24.50
NU	M	O = 14.00 E = 17.30	O = 29.00 E = 25.70
	F	O = 8.00 E = 16.50	O = 33.00 E = 24.50

Chi Square = 41.4714 for 7 d.f.
p< .001

Table 104a. Subjects Reports of Feeling Like an Outsider, or an Insider, Vis-aVis Being an American.

		Outsider	Insider	Outsider /Insider	Not Applicable
H	M	30 60%	10 20%	1 2%	7 14%
	F	32 64%	10 20%	0 0%	4 8%
W	M	35 70%	10 20%	0 0%	4 8%
	F	36 72%	11 22%	0 0%	2 4%
U	M	22 44%	25 50%	0 0%	1 2%
	F	11 22%	35 70%	0 0%	1 2%
NU	M	6 12%	39 78%	0 0%	3 6%
	F	8 16%	38 76%	0 0%	3 6%
Totals		180 45%	178 45%	1 0%	25 6%

Table 104b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 104a.

		Outsider	Insider
H	M	O = 30.00 E = 20.11	O = 10.00 E = 19.89
	F	O = 32.00 E = 21.12	O = 10.00 E = 20.88
W	M	O = 35.00 E = 22.63	O = 10.00 E = 22.37
	F	O = 36.00 E = 23.63	O = 11.00 E = 23.37
U	M	O = 22.00 E = 23.63	O = 25.00 E = 23.37
	F	O = 11.00 E = 23.13	O = 35.00 E = 22.87
NU	M	O = 6.00 E = 22.63	O = 39.00 E = 22.37
	F	O = 8.00 E = 23.13	O = 38.00 E = 22.87

Chi Square = 105.1811 for 7 d.f.
p<.001

As will be noted from an inspection of the above tables, in which all of the Chi Square values are significant, there is the very definite tendency for hippies to see themselves as alienated from middle class society, from the age of technology, from western culture, and from "being an American." The item which discriminates best among the hippie groups and the non-hippie groups seems to be the one which concerns being an American. Over two-thirds of the hippies characterize themselves as outsiders; less than one-fourth of the non users and of the female users see themselves in this way. The male users, as has so often been the case, fall between these two categories and almost one-half of them report feeling like an outsider.

It should be noted that over 60% of <u>all</u> subjects see themselves as outsiders vis-a-vis traditional middle class institutions (including 56% of users and 36% of non users); that almost half of all respondents see themselves as outsiders to the age of technology (including 41% of users and 32% of non users). It seems that although differences between the groups are significant, there is a widespread feeling of alienation among contemporary youth. These data suggest that a large proportion of the total sample see themselves as alienated from certain social institutions. The "flight to hippiedom" may be seen not so much as a determinant of behavior, or a discriminator among groups which are markedly different in all

areas, but rather as one form of reaction which may be taken to a dissatisfying environment. Our data suggest that those who become hippies have a history of self-perceived detachment from family and peers which antedates their alienation from society.

The pattern of widespread disaffection with, or alienation from, the United States Government can be clearly seen from the analyses of subjects' agreement or disagreement, on a five point scale, with a number of statements about the government and the country.

First subjects were asked to respond to the statement: "In government today there is no one you can really trust." The analyses pertaining to the responses to this question are presented in Table 105 below.

Table 105a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "In government today there is no one you can really trust." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	50	2.020	1.049
	2 Weekenders	50	1.980	1.068
	3 Users	49	2.898	1.147
	4 Non Users	49	3.429	1.161
Females	5 Hippies	48	1.687	.982
	6 Weekenders	49	1.755	.937
	7 Users	50	2.500	1.082
	8 Non Users	50	2.860	1.114

Table 105b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 105a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	588.177	394			
Treat	135.834	7	19.405	16.602	
Factor 1	119.955	3	39.985	34.209	.01
Factor 2	13.347	1	13.347	11.419	.01
1 Times 2	2.532	3	.844	.722	NS
Resid.	452.344	387	1.169		

Table 105c. Duncan Multiple Range Test on Data Presented in Table 105a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 5	1.742*	.494
Mean 4 - Mean 6	1.674*	.488
Mean 4 - Mean 2	1.449*	.481
Mean 4 - Mean 1	1.409*	.472
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.929*	.461
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.569*	.446
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.531*	.424
Mean 3 - Mean 5	1.211*	.488
Mean 3 - Mean 6	1.143*	.481
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.918*	.472
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.878*	.461
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.398	.446
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.038	.424
Mean 8 - Mean 5	1.173*	.481
Mean 8 - Mean 6	1.105*	.472
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.880*	.461
Mean 8 - Mean 1	.840*	.446
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.360	.424
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.813*	.472
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.745*	.461
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.520*	.446
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.480*	.424
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.333	.461
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.265	.446
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.040	.424
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.293	.446
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.225	.424
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.068	.424

Respondents in the hippie groups tend to agree with this statement. The male users and the female users and non users tend to be uncertain about whether they agree or disagree. The male non users are the only group who disagree with the statement.

Subjects were asked to respond to the statement "However poor the conventional system, when you get right down to it, it works." The analyses of these responses are presented in Table 106 below.

Table 106a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "However poor the conventional system, when you get right down to it, it works." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	4.286	1.050
	2 Weekenders	50	4.060	.947
	3 Users	49	3.959	1.068
	4 Non Users	48	3.062	1.126
Females	5 Hippies	48	4.187	1.054
	6 Weekenders	49	3.939	1.168
	7 Users	49	3.694	1.073
	8 Non Users	50	3.140	1.020

Table 106b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 106a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	516.847	391			
Treat	72.739	7	10.391	8.985	
Factor 1	70.270	3	23.423	20.253	.01
Factor 2	1.235	1	1.235	1.068	NS
1 Times 2	1.234	3	.411	.356	NS
Resid.	444.108	384	1.157		

Table 106c. Duncan Multiple Range Test for Data Presented in Table 106a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 1 - Mean 4	1.224*	.492
Mean 1 - Mean 8	1.146*	.486
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.592*	.479
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.347	.470
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.327	.459
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.226	.444
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.099	.422
Mean 5 - Mean 4	1.125*	.486
Mean 5 - Mean 8	1.047*	.479
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.493*	.470
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.248	.459
Mean 5 - Mean 3	.228	.444
Mean 5 - Mean 2	.127	.422
Mean 2 - Mean 4	.998*	.479
Mean 2 - Mean 8	.920*	.470
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.366	.459
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.121	.444
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.101	.422
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.897*	.470
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.819*	.459
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.265	.444
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.020	.422
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.877*	.459
Mean 6 - Mean 8	.799*	.444
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.245	.422
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.632*	.444
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.554*	.422
Mean 8 - Mean 4	.078	.422

The males and females in both hippie groups, and the male users tend to agree with this statement and they are significantly different from the non users. The female users tend also to agree with the statement, but less strongly than do the male and female hippies. The non users are significantly different from all other groups, but even their mean position is within the "uncertain" category. In fact only six percent of the non-user males, &nd none of the non-user females (generally the most conservative group) disagree strongly with this statement.

Subjects were asked to rate their agreement or disagreement with the statement: "The way things are in the United States, I'd like to emigrate to another country." The analyses pertaining to this statement are presented in Table 107 below.

Table 107a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "The way things are in the United States, I'd like emigrate to another country." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	2.939	1.268
	2 Weekenders	50	2.760	1.320
	3 Users	49	3.347	1.364
	4 Non Users	49	3.592	1.211
Females	5 Hippies	49	2.653	1.221
	6 Weekenders	49	3.327	1.219
	7 Users	50	3.240	1.141
	8 Non Users	50	3.940	1.139

Table 107b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 107a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	668.947	394			
Treat	64.254	7	9.179	5.875	
Factor 1	51.029	3	17.010	10.886	.01
Factor 2	1.815	1	1.815	1.162	NS
1 Times 2	11.411	3	3.804	2.434	NS
Resid.	604.693	387	1.563		

Table 107c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 107a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 8 - Mean 5	1.287*	.571
Mean 8 - Mean 2	1.180*	.565
Mean 8 - Mean 1	1.001*	.556
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.700*	.546
Mean 8 - Mean 6	.613*	.533
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.593*	.516
Mean 8 - Mean 4	.348	.490
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.939*	.565
Mean 4 - Mean 2	.832*	.556
Mean 4 - Mean 1	.653*	.546
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.352	.533
Mean 4 - Mean 6	.265	.516
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.245	.490
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.694*	.556
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.587*	.546
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.408	.533
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.107	.516
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.020	.490
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.674*	.546
Mean 6 - Mean 2	.567*	.533
Mean 6 - Mean 1	.388	.516
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.087	.490
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.587*	.533
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.480	.516
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.301	.490
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.286	.516
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.179	.490
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.107	.490

The male and female hippies and male weekenders seem to be strongest in their agreement with this statement. The female weekenders, the male and female users, and the male non users tend to be uncertain as to their position. The female non users, invariably the most conservative, are the only group who on the average disagree with the statement.

Perhaps the most interesting of these series of statements is: "This country would be better off if therewere a real revolt," because the distribution of responses is so wide that the item seems to discriminate well between groups. The analyses of responses to this statement are presented below in Table 108.

Table 108a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "This country would be better off if there were a real revolt." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	2.224	1.298
	2 Weekenders	50	2.180	1.108
	3 Users	49	3.327	1.346
	4 Non Users	49	4.143	1.010
Females	5 Hippies	48	1.917	1.077
	6 Weekenders	49	2.143	1.125
	7 Users	50	3.120	1.013
	8 Non Users	50	3.740	.996

Table 108b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 108a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	745.462	393			
Treat	244.209	7	34.887	26.865	
Factor 1	236.805	3	78.935	60.786	.01
Factor 2	4.914	1	4.914	3.784	NS
1 Times 2	2.490	3	.830	.639	NS
Resid.	501.253	386	1.299		

Table 108c. Duncan Multiple Range Test for Data Presented in Table 108a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 5	2.226*	.521
Mean 4 - Mean 6	2.000*	.515
Mean 4 - Mean 2	1.963*	.507
Mean 4 - Mean 1	1.919*	.498
Mean 4 - Mean 7	1.023*	.486
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.816*	.470
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.403	.447
Mean 8 - Mean 5	1.823*	.515
Mean 8 - Mean 6	1.597*	.507
Mean 8 - Mean 2	1.560*	.498
Mean 8 - Mean 1	1.516*	.486
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.620*	.470
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.413	.447
Mean 3 - Mean 5	1.410*	.507
Mean 3 - Mean 6	1.184*	.498
Mean 3 - Mean 2	1.147*	.486
Mean 3 - Mean 1	1.103*	.470
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.207	.447
Mean 7 - Mean 5	1.203*	.498
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.977*	.486
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.940*	.470
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.896*	.447
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.307	.486
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.081	.470
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.044	.447
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.263	.470
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.037	.447
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.226	.447

Subjects in the hippie groups tend to agree with this statement; while there are no significant differences among any of the hippie groups, all four of them do differ significantly from every other group. In fact, 64% of all subjects in the hippie groups said that they agree with this statement either "strongly" or "very strongly." The users have a mean score in the "uncertain" category. Only 22% agree with the statement. The male and female non users are the only groups whose mean scores are in the "disagreement"

category. Sixty-six percent of the non users are in disagreement with this statement; only eight percent are in agreement.

Alienation from American political institutions is quite widespread. Nevertheless, the hippie groups are consistently more disaffected than are any of the others. They tend to welcome revolution, to feel that the government cannot be trusted, that the system does not work, and that emigration is a positive act. In most of these sentiments, with the noteworthy exception of revolution, they are joined by the users. The non users do seem to be quite different and by and large cannot be seen as disaffected youth.

Government is not the only institution from which subjects feel alienated. Subjects were also questioned about their attitudes toward the institution of the family. First subjects were asked to rate themselves on a scale of agreement with the statement: "It would be better for kids if families were replaced by a better system." The analyses pertaining to these data are to be found in Table 109 below.

Table 109a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "It would be better for kids if families were replaced by a better system." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	50	3.100	1.237
	2 Weekenders	50	2.840	1.302
	3 Users	49	3.612	1.275
	4 Non Users	49	4.102	.974
Females	5 Hippies	49	2.673	1.315
	6 Weekenders	48	2.812	1.253
	7 Users	50	3.560	1.023
	8 Non Users	50	4.480	.806

Table 109b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 109a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	680.800	394			
Treat	148.570	7	21.224	15.433	
Factor 1	140.446	3	46.815	34.041	.01
Factor 2	.033	1	.033	.024	NS
1 Times 2	8.091	3	2.697	1.961	NS
Resid.	532.230	387	1.375		

Table 109c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 109a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 8 - Mean 5	1.807*	.536
Mean 8 - Mean 6	1.668*	.529
Mean 8 - Mean 2	1.640*	.522
Mean 8 - Mean 1	1.380*	.512
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.920*	.500
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.868*	.484
Mean 8 - Mean 4	.378	.460
Mean 4 - Mean 5	1.429*	.529
Mean 4 - Mean 6	1.290*	.522
Mean 4 - Mean 2	1.262*	.512
Mean 4 - Mean 1	1.002*	.500
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.542*	.484
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.490*	.460
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.939*	.522
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.800*	.512
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.772*	.500
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.512*	.484
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.052	.460
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.887*	.512
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.748*	.500
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.720*	.484
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.460*	.460
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.427	.500
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.288	.484
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.260	.460
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.167	.484
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.028	.460
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.139	.460

Significantly more of the subjects in all of the hippie groups, both male and female, agree with the statement than do any of the other groups. Thirty percent of the subjects in these groups agree with this statement; 32% disagree. The users, both male and female, differ significantly from the hippie groups on the one hand and the non users on the other. Only 16% of the the users agree with the statement; 57% of them disagree. Finally, the non users are

in clear disagreement with the statement. Only six percent of the non users agree with it; 80% of them disagree. It seems that this is an item which discriminates well between the groups. Perhaps the alienation of the hippies from their own families underlies their alienation from the concept of the family as an institution.

Subjects were asked to rate themselves on a scale of agreement with the statement: "Many parents really mess up their kids." The data analyses of responses to this statement are presented below in Table 110.

Table 110a. Mean Scores for All groups in Response to the Statement: "Many parents really mess up their kids." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	50	1.720	.981
	2 Weekenders	49	1.612	.694
	3 Users	49	1.816	.919
	4 Non Users	49	2.327	.977
Females	5 Hippies	49	1.653	.744
	6 Weekenders	48	1.687	.651
	7 Users	50	1.780	.901
	8 Non Users	50	2.360	1.054

Table 110b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 110a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	334.398	393			
Treat	31.049	7	4.436	5.644	
Factor 1	30.740	3	10.247	13.039	.01
Factor 2	.003	1	.003	.003	NS
1 Times 2	.306	3	.102	.130	NS
Resid.	303.350	386	.786		

Table 110c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 110a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.748*	.405
Mean 8 - Mean 5	.707*	.400
Mean 8 - Mean 6	.673*	.394
Mean 8 - Mean 1	.640*	.387
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.580*	.378
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.544*	.366
Mean 8 - Mean 4	.033	.348
Mean 4 - Mean 2	.715*	.400
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.674*	.394
Mean 4 - Mean 6	.640*	.387
Mean 4 - Mean 1	.607*	.378
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.547*	.366
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.511*	.348
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.204	.394
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.163	.387
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.129	.378
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.096	.366
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.036	.348
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.168	.387
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.127	.378
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.093	.366
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.060	.348
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.108	.378
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.067	.366
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.033	.348
Mean 6 - Mean 2	.075	.366
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.034	.348
Mean 5 - Mean 2	.041	.348

Subjects within all of the hippie groups and within the user group do not differ significantly from each other. The vast majority of these subjects agree with the statement. In fact, 87% of the subjects in the hippie groups and 84% of the users agree with this statement. The non users differ significantly from all of the other groups. Essentially, the majority of them (67%) agree,

but a substantial proportion are uncertain (17%) or disagree (15%) with the statement. While this statement is apparently not a good discriminator among groups, the indictment of parenthood by the vast majority of subjects in all groups is striking.

Perhaps one fundamental underlying difference between the hippies and the non hippies is that the hippies, having seen the failure of the social institutions as they exist, are far more likely to be willing to do away with the institutions. Hence, while they are not the only group to feel that "Parents mess up their kids," or to disagree with the statement that "However poor the conventional system is, it works," they are far more likely to feel that the family should be replaced by another system, or that revolution would benefit the country.

Finally, subjects were asked to respond to a statement about one of the major institutions of the society: the public schools. They were asked to rate themselves on a scale of agreement with the statement: "Schools are becoming more and more irrelevant to what's happening." The analyses of these data are presented in Table 111 below.

Table 111a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "Schools are becoming more and more irrelevant to what's happening today." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	50	2.040	1.248
	2 Weekenders	49	1.939	.956
	3 Users	49	2.694	1.373
	4 Non Users	48	3.042	1.154
Females	5 Hippies	48	1.896	1.159
	6 Weekenders	48	2.187	1.333
	7 Users	50	2.560	1.116
	8 Non Users	50	3.180	1.178

Table 111b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 111a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	646.765	391			
Treat	86.212	7	12.316	8.437	
Factor 1	83.291	3	27.764	19.019	.01
Factor 2	.163	1	.163	.112	NS
1 Times 2	2.758	3	.919	.630	NS
Resid.	560.553	384	1.460		

Table 111c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 111a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 8 - Mean 5	1.284*	.552
Mean 8 - Mean 2	1.241*	.546
Mean 8 - Mean 1	1.140*	.538
Mean 8 - Mean 6	.993*	.528
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.620*	.516
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.486	.499
Mean 8 - Mean 4	.138	.474
Mean 4 - Mean 5	1.146*	.546
Mean 4 - Mean 2	1.103*	.538
Mean 4 - Mean 1	1.002*	.528
Mean 4 - Mean 6	.855	.516
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.482	.499
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.348	.474
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.798*	.538
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.755*	.528
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.654*	.516
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.507*	.499
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.134	.474
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.664*	.528
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.621*	.516
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.520*	.499
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.373	.474
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.291	.516
Mean 6 - Mean 2	.248	.499
Mean 6 - Mean 1	.147	.474
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.144	.499
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.101	.474
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.043	.474

With the exception of the female weekenders whose views do not differ significantly from the view of the female users, significantly more subjects in all of the hippie groups tend to agree with this statement than do subjects in the other groups. Seventy-four percent of subjects in the hippie groups manifest agreement with this statement. The users tend toward a mean position of uncertainty; but 51% of them agree with the statement. The non users

also tend to adopt a mean position of uncertainty, but fewer of them (31%) are in agreement. While this statement does not seem to be a major discriminator between groups, the greater disaffection of the hippies as well as the tendency toward widespread disaffection among all groups are both striking.

The data presented in this section on alienation from existing social institutions are strikingly consistent. Significantly more subjects in the hippie groups tend to perceive themselves as being alienated from, and outsiders to, the society than do subjects in the other groups. In addition, the hippies tend not only to be more critical of various institutions such as government, family, and school, but are also more likely to consider the abolishment of these institutions.

It seems paradoxical that those who manifest the greatest concern about the condition of mankind, are also those who are the most alienated from individual human beings on both an interpersonal and institutional level. When asked to relate what they see themselves as doing five years from now, subjects in the hippie groups are far more likely than others to mention such things as "working for change," "revolution," and "fighting the system." Similarly, when asked to choose what well known person they would most like to be or have been, subjects in the hippie groups are more likely to choose such revolutionary figures as "Che Guevera," "Fidel Castro," and "Leon Trotsky" than are subjects in other groups. Subjects in the non-hippie groups are more likely to choose such figures as "Martin Luther King," and "Jack Kennedy." Hence, while many subjects in all groups choose men of ideals, the hippie subjects choose those who have worked to change the system even at the risk of violence, while the non-hippie subjects choose those who have worked within the system. Hence, it can be said that many of the hippies in our sample have a commitment to social change; their ability to make a strong personal commitment to individuals rather than to causes is somewhat questionable.

3. Alienation from Traditionally Valued Goals and Concepts:

What follows is a discussion of how the subjects see themselves in relation to the dominant value structure of middle class America. That is, the discussion will center around the relationship of individuals to the values which might be termed the modal value structure of this country. Thus, for example, we will discuss the relationship to work in the context of a society which, through its Protestant Ethic heritage, has typically placed a premium on success through hard work. In a society which stresses the ability of the individual to overcome obstacles, we shall examine the subjects' feelings regarding future potential for success.

First subjects were asked to characterize their chances of becoming a success according to society's definition of success. The scale positions ranged from "no chance of success" to "excellent chance of success."

Table 112a. Mean Scale Positions of Subjects in All Groups on Possibility of Becoming a Success (Society's Definition of Success). (1 = no chance of becoming a success).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	47	2.277	1.425
	2 Weekenders	50	2.020	1.140
	3 Users	48	2.625	1.218
	4 Non Users	50	3.100	1.025
Females	5 Hippies	47	1.426	.676
	6 Weekenders	49	1.592	.806
	7 Users	48	2.521	1.136
	8 Non Users	50	2.620	.998

Table 112b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 112a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	558.015	388			
Treat	108.796	7	15.542	13.182	
Factor 1	81.217	3	27.072	22.961	.01
Factor 2	20.694	1	20.694	17.552	.01
1 Times 2	6.884	3	2.295	1.946	NS
Resid.	449.220	381	1.179		

Table 112c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to the Data Presented in Table 112a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 5	1.674*	.496
Mean 4 - Mean 6	1.508*	.490
Mean 4 - Mean 2	1.080*	.483
Mean 4 - Mean 1	.823*	.474
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.579*	.463
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.480*	.448
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.475*	.426
Mean 3 - Mean 5	1.199*	.490
Mean 3 - Mean 6	1.033*	.483
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.605*	.474
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.348	.463
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.104	.448
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.005	.426
Mean 8 - Mean 5	1.194*	.483
Mean 8 - Mean 6	1.028*	.474
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.600*	.463
Mean 8 - Mean 1	.343	.448
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.099	.426
Mean 7 - Mean 5	1.095*	.474
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.929*	.463
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.501*	.448
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.244	.426
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.851*	.463
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.685*	.448
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.257	.426
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.594*	.448
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.428*	.426
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.166	.426

As can be seen from Table 112b, there are significant differences between groups and between the sexes. The hippies and weekenders feel that they have little or no chance of becoming a success, in terms of the societal definition of success. This feeling is even more prevalent among female hippies and weekenders than among the males. In fact, the mean female position is one of "no chance;" the mean male position is one of "slight chance." Only the non-user

males, who differ significantly from all groups on this item, feel that they have a "good chance" for success.

It is interesting to note that in response to an item asking subjects to characterize society's definition of success, all subjects use essentially the same concepts. Subjects in all groups feel that society defines success in terms of material possessions. Words used most commonly are: "money," "status - social and financial," "security," "material things," "possessions," "position," "competition," etc. Hence, it appears that subjects self-ratings on whether or not they have a good chance for success according to society's definition is done from a common frame of reference.

Subjects were also asked to rate their chances of success according to their own personal definition of success. The analyses of these responses are presented in Table 113 below.

Table 113a. Mean Scale Positions of Subjects in All Groups on the "possibility of becoming a success" (Personal Definition of Success). (1 = no chance of becoming a success.)

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	47	3.596	1.249
	2 Weekenders	49	3.551	1.051
	3 Users	48	3.521	1.060
	4 Non Users	50	3.760	.907
Females	5 Hippies	49	3.163	1.184
	6 Weekenders	50	3.300	1.005
	7 Users	49	3.469	.950
	8 Non Users	49	3.551	.905

Table 113b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 113a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	437.698	390			
Treat	11.637	7	1.662	1.494	
Factor 1	4.446	3	1.482	1.332	NS
Factor 2	5.522	1	5.522	4.964	.05
1 Times 2	1.669	3	.556	.500	NS
Resid.	426.061	383	1.112		

Table 113c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 113a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.597*	.482
Mean 4 - Mean 6	.460	.476
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.291	.469
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.239	.461
Mean 4 - Mean 2	.209	.450
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.209	.435
Mean 4 - Mean 1	.164	.413
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.433	.476
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.296	.469
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.127	.461
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.075	.450
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.045	.435
Mean 1 - Mean 8	.045	.413
Mean 8 - Mean 5	.388	.469
Mean 8 - Mean 6	.251	.461
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.082	.450
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.030	.435
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.000	.413
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.388	.461
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.251	.450
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.082	.435
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.030	.413
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.358	.450
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.221	.435
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.052	.413
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.306	.435
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.169	.413
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.137	.413

The contrast between the responses to the question about success according to society's definition and according to personal definition is striking. In terms of a personal definition, it may be seen that there is considerable anticipation of success. There is no difference among any of the groups; there is a sex difference which manifests itself only as a difference between the female hippies

and the male non users. In general, all subjects tend to see themselves as having a "good chance" to a "very good chance" of success, according to their personal definition.

In this context it is interesting to note some of the differences in the way in which the hippies and the non hippies define their personal version of success. Subjects in the hippie groups stress the ability to effect changes in the social order, self-actualization, and personal integrity. Most frequently repeated concepts are "revolution," "brotherhood," "social change," "do your own thing," "ability to create," "knowing - feeling - being," "don't prostitute yourself," "having control over one's life." Subjects in the non-hippie groups stress specific attainments. Most frequent concepts among these subjects are: "happy family," "ability to support a family," "a loving family," "children," "comfort," "high prestige," "education," "professional competence," "security - emotional, physical, and financial." It is interesting to note that "family" does not appear once among the hippie definitions of success. Also, "security" which is so important to the non hippies is mentioned by very few of the hippie subjects.

Subjects were asked how they feel about working for a living. Responses to this question are presented below in Table 114.

Table 114a. Responses to Question: "How do you feel about working for a living?"

		Bore	Middle Class Hangup	Necessary Evil	Take it or Leave it	Worthwhile in General	Worthwhile Only if You Want to
H	M	10 20%	2 4%	5 10%	3 6%	3 6%	23 46%
	F	9 18%	5 10%	4 8%	1 2%	1 2%	27 54%
W	M	7 14%	7 14%	6 12%	3 6%	1 2%	25 50%
	F	8 16%	3 6%	3 6%	3 6%	1 2%	31 62%
U	M	3 6%	1 2%	12 24%	2 4%	5 10%	26 52%
	F	2 4%	0 0%	5 10%	1 2%	7 14%	33 66%
NU	M	2 4%	1 2%	5 10%	0 0%	18 36%	24 48%
	F	1 2%	1 2%	10 20%	0 0%	9 18%	29 58%
Totals		42 11%	20 5%	50 13%	13 3%	45 11%	218 55%

Table 114b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented in Table 114a.

		Negative	Positive
H	M	O = 20.00 E = 15.06	O = 26.00 E = 30.94
	F	O = 20.00 E = 15.71	O = 28.00 E = 32.29
W	M	O = 23.00 E = 16.04	O = 26.00 E = 32.96
	F	O = 17.00 E = 16.04	O = 32.00 E = 32.96
U	M	O = 20.00 E = 16.70	O = 31.00 E = 34.30
	F	O = 8.00 E = 15.71	O = 40.00 E = 32.29
NU	M	O = 8.00 E = 16.37	O = 42.00 E = 33.63
	F	O = 12.00 E = 16.37	O = 38.00 E = 33.63

Chi Square = 23.4177 for 7 d.f.
$p < .01$

As will be noted from an examination of the above tables, approximately one-third of the subjects have nothing good to say about work, i.e., work is seen as a bore, a middle class hangup, or a necessary evil. A greater number than would be expected of the hippies, weekenders, and male users have negative views regarding work.

Subjects were also asked to rate their agreement or disagreement with the statement: "Life without a job would be a very boring and unsatisfying affair." The analyses pertaining to this question are presented below in Table 115.

Table 115a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "Life without a job would be a very boring and unsatisfying affair." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	3.469	1.279
	2 Weekenders	48	3.812	1.112
	3 Users	47	3.277	1.161
	4 Non Users	49	2.245	1.204
Females	5 Hippies	49	4.082	.965
	6 Weekenders	48	3.896	1.005
	7 Users	50	2.840	1.065
	8 Non Users	50	2.620	1.147

Table 115b. Analysis of Variance of Data in Table 115a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	639.644	389			
Treat	149.009	7	21.287	16.574	
Factor 1	131.559	3	43.853	34.143	.01
Factor 2	2.293	1	2.293	1.785	NS
1 Times 2	15.157	3	5.052	3.934	NS
Resid.	490.635	382	1.284		

Table 115c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 115a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 5 - Mean 4	1.837*	.518
Mean 5 - Mean 8	1.462*	.512
Mean 5 - Mean 7	1.242*	.504
Mean 5 - Mean 3	.805*	.495
Mean 5 - Mean 1	.613*	.483
Mean 5 - Mean 2	.270	.468
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.186	.444
Mean 6 - Mean 4	1.651*	.512
Mean 6 - Mean 8	1.276*	.504
Mean 6 - Mean 7	1.056*	.495
Mean 6 - Mean 3	.619*	.483
Mean 6 - Mean 1	.427	.468
Mean 6 - Mean 2	.084	.444
Mean 2 - Mean 4	1.567*	.504
Mean 2 - Mean 8	1.192*	.495
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.972*	.483
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.535*	.468
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.343	.444
Mean 1 - Mean 4	1.224*	.495
Mean 1 - Mean 8	.849*	.483
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.629*	.468
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.192	.444
Mean 3 - Mean 4	1.032*	.483
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.657*	.468
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.437	.444
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.595*	.468
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.220	.444
Mean 8 - Mean 4	.375	.444

The female hippies (70%) and weekenders (64%) and the weekender males (68%) are essentially in disagreement with this statement. The hippie males (52%) tend also to disagree, but their mean score is significantly lower than that of the female hippies who have the highest mean score. In fact, the position of the male hippies is not significantly different from that of the male users (42% disagree). The female users (34%) and the non users (22%) show

significantly less disagreement than do the other groups. These differences among groups in the attitude toward work are rather striking. To put it yet another way, only 15% of hippie subjects agree that life without a job would be unsatisfying; 63% of the non users agree with this statement.

Finally, subjects were asked to choose whether they would prefer working for a salary or not working and obtaining a small guaranteed income. The distribution of responses is presented below in Table 116.

Table 116. Responses to Question: "If it were possible to choose between working for a decent salary or not working and obtaining a small guaranteed income, which would you choose?"

		Working for Decent Salary	Living on Guaranteed Income
H	M	9 18%	40 80%
	F	1 2%	49 98%
W	M	14 28%	36 72%
	F	6 12%	42 84%
U	M	32 64%	15 30%
	F	36 72%	13 26%
NU	M	42 84%	7 14%
	F	43 86%	7 14%
Totals		183 46%	209 52%

Chi Square analysis was not performed since one cell frequency [illegible] only [illegible]. However, it is noteworthy that whereas only 15% overall of hippies and weekenders choose "working for a decent salary," 77% of the aggregate of users and non users make this choice. It seems clear that the issue of work is a major discriminator between the hippies and weekenders on the one hand, and the users and non users on the other. Apparently, among the latter groups, work is seen as intrinsically important and rewarding, whereas among the hippie groups "doing one's own thing" is more important, with work itself seen only as a means to survival.

Just as emphasis on work and success is part of the dominant American value structure, an emphasis on future time planning is also a part of this value structure. Subjects were asked to state the time span which comes to mind when making future plans. Analysis of responses to this question are presented in Table 117 below.

Table 117a. Responses to Question: "What span of time comes to mind when making future plans?"

		A Few Days	A Few Weeks	A Few Months	A Year	A Few Years	After Finish School	Other
H	M	6 12%	2 4%	6 12%	7 14%	16 32%	5 10%	5 10%
	F	6 12%	5 10%	11 22%	8 16%	9 18%	2 4%	7 14%
W	M	5 10%	3 6%	5 10%	10 20%	13 26%	10 20%	3 6%
	F	5 10%	3 6%	13 26%	12 24%	9 18%	8 16%	0 0%
U	M	2 4%	0 0%	6 12%	3 6%	18 36%	14 28%	6 12%
	F	2 4%	1 2%	2 4%	16 32%	13 26%	14 28%	1 2%
NU	M	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	7 14%	11 22%	23 46%	5 10%
	F	2 4%	0 0%	1 2%	6 12%	13 26%	23 46%	5 10%
Totals		28 7%	15 4%	45 11%	69 17%	102 26%	99 25%	32 8%

Table 117b. Results of Chi Square Analysis Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 117a.

		Up to a Few Months	A Year	More Than a Year
H	M	O = 14.00 E = 10.41	O = 7.00 E = 8.07	O = 21.00 E = 23.52
	F	O = 22.00 E = 10.16	O = 8.00 E = 7.88	O = 11.00 E = 22.96
W	M	O = 13.00 E = 11.40	O = 10.00 E = 8.84	O = 23.00 E = 25.75
	F	O = 21.00 E = 12.40	O = 12.00 E = 9.61	O = 17.00 E = 27.99
U	M	O = 8.00 E = 10.66	O = 3.00 E = 8.26	O = 32.00 E = 24.08
	F	O = 5.00 E = 11.90	O = 16.00 E = 9.23	O = 27.00 E = 26.87
NU	M	O = 3.00 E = 10.91	O = 7.00 E = 8.46	O = 34.00 E = 24.64
	F	O = 3.00 E = 11.16	O = 6.00 E = 8.65	O = 36.00 E = 25.19

Chi Square = 69.7666 for 14 d.f.
$p < .01$

As will be noted above, there is a tendency for the hippies and the weekenders, particularly among the females, to plan in terms of a considerably more abbreviated time period than do the users and the non users, the majority of whom plan in terms of more than a year. This tendency to live in the present, taken together with the downgrading of the intrinsic merit of work, is distinctly anti-capitalistic, and at odds with the value structure of this country. Thus, the notion that the hippie groups are alienated from a traditional emphasis on material success, work, and future time planning is supported by the data.

SUMMARY

In this section on alienation, the following has emerged:

1) Subjects in the hippie groups tend to feel alienated from their families. Their relationships with their families tend to be characterized not by hostility, but rather by neutrality. Many of them do not appear to have close interpersonal relationships; rather they substitute a large number of casual acquaintances. Perhaps their emphasis on love for all is a defense against the anxiety attendant upon closeness to a few. This anxiety may be a function of a history of family tension and estrangement.

2) Subjects in the hippie groups tend to describe themselves as alienated from the major institutions of society: government, family, school. While many subjects in the non-hippie groups, particularly the users, also see themselves as alienated and disaffected, the hippies are more likely to favor the downfall of the institutions which they criticize. While subjects in all groups are critical of government and family, a significantly larger number of the hippies favor revolution and the replacement of the family with another system. Perhaps differences between the groups may be characterized as follows: the non users tend to be accepting of the social institutions; the users tend to be critical, but do not favor the downfall of the institutions; the hippie groups are critical and in favor of terminating the institutions as they currently exist. Similarly, the users admire leaders who have worked for social change within the system; the hippie groups admire revolutionaries.

3) Subjects in the hippie groups tend to reject traditional American values related to an emphasis on material success, work, and planning for the future. The users are somewhat ambivalent in their responses, but tend to define success in terms of traditional concepts, e.g., education, job status, and family life. The non users are generally accepting of this framework.

4) The non hippies when compared to the hippies differ significantly on most measures of alienation. Nevertheless, when the data on the non hippies are examined in their own right it becomes clear that many of these youths are also disaffected and disenchanted. To the extent that they are in some ways representative of urban and suburban youth, it is apparent that there is considerable discontent among "ordinary" youth. Certainly, this discontent is not restricted to the hippies. Perhaps the historical role of the hippies has been to catalyze, crystallize and embody the malaise of a generation.

EXPERIENCE WITH AND ATTITUDES TOWARD SEXUALITY

D. Experience With and Attitudes Toward Sexuality:

Just as much has been written about the alienation of the hippies, so there has been a great deal of speculation about their attitudes and practices regarding sex. It was decided to include in the questionnaire a section on sexual attitudes and practices, in order to see whether and, if so, how much the hippies differ in their orientation from the non hippies. Moreover, we were also interested in possible differences between drug users and non users. As has been seen repeatedly throughout this report, the non users as a group are more conservative. They are far more accepting of the institutions and traditional values of America. While some of them do express dissatisfaction, they tend as a group toward acceptance of the status quo, or at the most to some uncertainty. It will be interesting to see whether this acceptance of the status quo and greater conservatism of the non users carries over into their sexual attitudes and practices.

The data regarding sexual practices and attitudes among the study groups are presented in two sections. The first deals with the personal aspects of sexuality: e.g., satisfaction, experiences, anxiety. The second section deals with more general attitudes and opinions.

1. Personal Aspects of Sexuality:

Subjects were asked whether they had ever had sexual intercourse and if so at what age. The chi square analysis on these data is presented in Table 118.

Table 118. Number of Subjects Reporting Sexual Intercourse Prior to Age 18, After Age 18, or No Intercourse.

		Under 18	Over 18	No Intercourse
H	M	O = 36.00 E = 27.50	O = 12.00 E = 12.62	O = 2.00 E = 9.87
	F	O = 33.00 E = 27.50	O = 12.00 E = 12.62	O = 5.00 E = 9.87
W	M	O = 40.00 E = 27.50	O = 7.00 E = 12.62	O = 3.00 E = 9.87
	F	O = 37.00 E = 27.50	O = 7.00 E = 12.62	O = 6.00 E = 9.87
U	M	O = 32.50 E = 27.50	O = 16.00 E = 12.62	O = 2.00 E = 9.87
	F	O = 19.00 E = 27.50	O = 21.00 E = 12.62	O = 10.00 E = 9.87
NU	M	O = 18.00 E = 27.50	O = 11.00 E = 12.62	O = 21.00 E = 9.87
	F	O = 5.00 E = 27.50	O = 15.00 E = 12.62	O = 30.00 E = 9.87

Chi Square = 124.7564 for 14 d.f.
p<.001

As can be seen from Table 118, the differences between the hippies and the weekenders are not noteworthy; this is true both in terms of whether or not the respondent has had intercourse and the age of first intercourse. The male users show a sexual history which is remarkably similar to that of the hippie males. The female users, as we have seen so many times are between the hippie groups and the non users. The vast majority of the female users have had intercourse; among half of those who have, this has been past the age of 18. Finally, the history of the non users, both male and female, is quite different. Among the female non users, generally our most conservative group, the majority have not yet had intercourse; among those who have,the majority were past the age of 18.

Subjects were questioned regarding the length of time they had known the person with whom they first had sexual intercourse. The distribution of responses to this item are presented below in Table 119. No Chi Square analysis was performed because of the broad distribution of responses.

Table 119. Period of Time Subjects Report Having Known the Person with Whom They First Had Sexual Intercourse.

		A Day	Several Days	A Week	Several Weeks	More Than a Week	More Than 6 mos.	2-3 Years	3-5 Years	5 Years or More	Child-hood Friend	No Inter-course
H+	M	14 28%	3 6%	5 10%	9 18%	12 24%	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	3 6%	2 4%
	F	5 10%	7 14%	3 6%	5 10%	13 26%	5 10%	5 10%	2 4%	0 0%	0 0%	5 10%
W	M	8 16%	1 2%	1 2%	6 12%	17 34%	7 14%	5 10%	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	3 6%
	F	3 6%	3 6%	1 2%	4 8%	21 42%	7 14%	4 8%	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	6 12%
U	M	15 30%	2 4%	4 8%	4 8%	7 14%	6 12%	3 6%	0 0%	1 2%	2 4%	2 4%
	F	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	16 32%	7 14%	8 16%	3 6%	1 2%	2 4%	10 20%
NU	M	6 12%	4 8%	0 0%	7 14	4 8%	5 10%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	21 42%
	F	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	3 6%	2 4%	5 10%	6 12%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%	30 60%
Totals		53 13%	20 5%	14 4%	40 10%	92 23%	43 11%	32 8%	9 2%	6 2%	8 2%	79 20%

Inspection of Table 119 reveals a number of interesting trends. The non-user females and female users tend to have had their first sexual experience with someone whom they had known for at least a month. The non-user males are more likely to have had their first sexual experience with someone they had known for less than a month. However, it should be noted once again that three out of five female non users, and two out of five male non users have never had intercourse.

Among the hippies and users there is a large proportion of males whose first sexual experience occurred at the first meeting. Among the female hippies and both groups of weekenders, the largest proportion of subjects report first sexual experience after more than a month of acquaintanceship.

Subjects were asked to express their agreement or disagreement on a five point scale with the statement: "Getting involved sexually is very difficult for me." The mean response for all groups, the analysis of variance, and the results of the Duncan Multiple Range Test are presented below in Table 120.

Table 120a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to Statement: "Getting involved sexually is very difficult for me." (1 = stronly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	3.735	1.006
	2 Weekenders	49	3.755	1.001
	3 Users	48	3.792	1.040
	4 Non Users	46	3.522	1.058
Females	5 Hippies	47	3.787	.944
	6 Weekenders	50	3.780	.965
	7 Users	48	3.583	1.115
	8 Non Users	50	3.160	1.084

Table 120b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 120a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	425.354	386	.		
Treat	16.508	7	2.358	2.186	
Factor 1	12.250	3	4.083	3.785	.05
Factor 2	1.604	1	1.604	1.487	NS
1 Times 2	2.654	3	.885	.820	NS
Resid.	408.846	379	1.079		

Table 120c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 120a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.632*	.475
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.270	.469
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.209	.462
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.057	.454
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.037	.443
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.012	.429
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.005	.407
Mean 5 - Mean 8	.627*	.469
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.265	.462
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.204	.454
Mean 5 - Mean 1	.052	.443
Mean 5 - Mean 2	.032	.429
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.007	.407
Mean 6 - Mean 8	.620*	.462
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.258	.454
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.197	.443
Mean 6 - Mean 1	.045	.429
Mean 6 - Mean 2	.025	.407
Mean 2 - Mean 8	.595*	.454
Mean 2 - Mean 4	.233	.443
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.172	.429
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.020	.407
Mean 1 - Mean 8	.575*	.443
Mean 1 - Mean 4	.213	.429
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.152	.407
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.423	.429
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.061	.407
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.362	.407

As can be seen from Table 120b, the only significant difference is the one between groups. There are no significant differences between sexes. There is a statistically significant difference between the female non users and all other groups, with the exception of the male non users. While the differences between the male non users and all other groups are in the expected direction, these differences are not statistically significant. While subjects in all other groups tend to disagree with the statement, 64% of the non-user females either express agreement or uncertaintv. It is noteworthy, however, that 33%, or one out of every three, of the subjects in the hippie groups expresses either agreement or uncertainty. It seems that

many of the hippies are not free of anxiety when it comes to sexuality.

Subjects were asked to respond to the statement: "I worry about being good in bed." The analysis of these data are presented in Table 121 below.

Table 121a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "I worry about being good in bed." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	47	3.638	1.080
	2 Weekenders	50	3.520	1.100
	3 Users	46	3.370	1.186
	4 Non Users	48	3.437	.911
Females	5 Hippies	48	3.729	.884
	6 Weekenders	49	3.857	.990
	7 Users	48	3.562	1.116
	8 Non Users	49	3.429	1.050

Table 121b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 121a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	428.426	384			
Treat	9.273	7	1.325	1.192	
Factor 1	5.388	3	1.796	1.615	NS
Factor 2	2.229	1	2.229	2.005	NS
1 Times 2	1.656	3	.552	.497	NS
Resid.	419.153	377	1.112		

As can be seen from Table 121b, the analysis of variance shows no differences between any of the groups. Nevertheless, distribution of responses to this statement supports the previous finding, that the hippie groups are not anxiety free when it comes to sexual behavior. There is some suggestion that this is more of an issue for the males than for the females. Forty percent of the male hippies and 40% of the male weekenders either agree with the statement that they "worry about being good in bed" or refuse to commit themselves

on this point; only 30% of the female hippies and 28% of the female weekenders follow this response pattern. The users, both male and female approximate the response pattern of the hippie and weekender males. The non users, by and large, refuse to commit themselves on this item.

Subjects were asked to agree or disagree with the statement: "My sex life is as good as average." The analyses applied to the data on this item are presented in Table 122.

Table 122a. Mean Scores of All Subjects in Response to Statement: "My sex life is at least as good as average." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	46	2.109	.961
	2 Weekenders	49	2.082	.965
	3 Users	46	2.326	.979
	4 Non Users	50	2.660	1.107
Females	5 Hippies	46	1.978	.821
	6 Weekenders	48	1.979	.878
	7 Users	48	2.271	1.075
	8 Non Users	49	2.510	.906

Table 122b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 122a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	278.359	381			
Treat	21.218	7	3.031	3.174	
Factor 1	19.946	3	6.649	6.962	.01
Factor 2	1.154	1	1.154	1.209	NS
1 Times 2	.118	3	.039	.041	NS
Resid.	357.140	374	.995		

Table 122c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 122a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.682*	.447
Mean 4 - Mean 6	.681*	.441
Mean 4 - Mean 2	.578*	.435
Mean 4 - Mean 1	.551*	.427
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.389	.417
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.334	.403
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.150	.383
Mean 8 - Mean 5	.532*	.441
Mean 8 - Mean 6	.531*	.435
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.428*	.427
Mean 8 - Mean 1	.401	.417
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.239	.403
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.184	.383
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.348	.435
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.347	.427
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.244	.417
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.217	.403
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.055	.383
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.293	.427
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.292	.417
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.189	.403
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.162	.383
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.131	.417
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.130	.403
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.027	.383
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.104	.403
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.103	.383
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.001	.383

As can be seen from the analysis of variance, the only significant difference is a group difference. There are no significant differences between the sexes on this item. Essentially, the male and female non users are significantly different from all of the other groups. While mean scores for all groups are on the "agree" side of the continuum, the degree of agreement is slightly less for the non users than it is for all other groups.

Finally, subjects were asked to respond to the statement "Sex makes me feel guilty." The analyses pertaining to the responses to this statement are presented in Table 123 below.

Table 123a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to Statement: "Sex makes me feel guilty." (1 = strongly agree)

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	4.224	.887
	2 Weekenders	49	4.306	.676
	3 Users	47	4.106	.881
	4 Non Users	50	3.900	1.025
Females	5 Hippies	47	4.362	.810
	6 Weekenders	49	4.102	.789
	7 Users	48	4.104	.963
	8 Non Users	51	4.020	.852

Table 123b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 123a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	300.523	389			
Treat	7.816	7	1.117	1.457	
Factor 1	5.982	3	1.994	2.602	NS
Factor 2	.010	1	.010	.013	NS
1 Times 2	1.823	3	.608	.793	NS
Resid.	292.707	382	.766		

As can be seen from Table 123b, the analysis of variance shows no significant differences between groups or sexes. In general, the great majority of subjects in all groups disagree with this statement. This ranges from disagreement with the statement expressed by 90% of the male weekenders to disagreement expressed by 68% of the non-user males.

The responses to these items taken together suggest that the hippie groups do not differ in any significant way from the users, and that even the non users show either the same response pattern as the other groups or one which is only slightly different. Differences between groups, where such differences even exist, are certainly not major. The data do not bear on the issue of whether or not the hippies are actually more promiscuous, but they do suggest that in terms of personal satisfaction and anxiety subjects in the various groups are not so different from each other.

2. Attitudes Toward and Opinions About Sexuality:

Subjects were asked to rate their degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement: "Teenagers should be able to receive information about birth control." Data analyses of the responses to this item are presented in Table 124 below.

Table 124a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to the Statement: "Teenagers Should Be Able to Receive Information about Birth Control. (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	46	1.478	.580
	2 Weekenders	48	1.521	.645
	3 Users	48	1.479	.645
	4 Non Users	49	1.816	.660
Females	5 Hippies	47	1.298	.457
	6 Weekenders	49	1.265	.441
	7 Users	50	1.500	.755
	8 Non Users	50	1.660	.651

Table 124b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 124a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	156.744	386			
Treat	10.860	7	1.551	4.030	
Factor 1	7.905	3	2.635	6.845	.01
Factor 2	1.957	1	1.957	5.085	.05
1 Times 2	.998	3	.333	.864	NS
Resid.	145.884	379	.385		

Table 124c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 124a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 6	.551*	.284
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.518*	.280
Mean 4 - Mean 1	.338*	.276
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.337*	.271
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.316*	.265
Mean 4 - Mean 2	.295*	.256
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.156	.243
Mean 8 - Mean 6	.395*	.280
Mean 8 - Mean 5	.362*	.276
Mean 8 - Mean 1	.182	.271
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.181	.265
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.160	.256
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.139	.243
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.256	.276
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.223	.271
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.043	.265
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.042	.256
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.021	.243
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.235	.271
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.202	.265
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.022	.256
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.021	.243
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.214	.265
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.181	.256
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.001	.243
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.213	.256
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.180	.243
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.033	.243

As can be seen from Table 124b, there is a significant difference both between groups and between sexes. It is clear from an inspection of the means that subjects in all groups agree with this statement. However, the male non users agree less strongly than any other group except the female non users. The female hippies and the female weekenders are in strongest agreement with the statement; they are in significantly stronger agreement than the non-user females.

Close examination of the data reveals that these differences are due more to the extremely small variation within groups than to any major differences between the groups. It is interesting that not a single subject disagrees strongly with this statement and only one percent of the entire sample disagrees at all.

Subjects were asked to respond to the statement: "Abortions, if a child is unwanted, should be legal." Analyses of the responses to this item are presented in Table 125 below.

Table 125a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to Statement: "Abortions if a Child is Unwanted Should be Legal." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	1.735	.875
	2 Weekenders	49	1.592	.697
	3 Users	48	1.667	.920
	4 Non Users	49	2.204	1.160
Females	5 Hippies	48	1.417	.702
	6 Weekenders	50	1.420	.777
	7 Users	49	1.755	1.152
	8 Non Users	49	2.061	1.185

Table 125b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 125a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	382.803	390			
Treat	27.065	7	3.866	4.163	
Factor 1	23.192	3	7.731	8.323	.01
Factor 2	1.828	1	1.828	1.968	NS
1 Times 2	2.045	3	.682	.734	NS
Resid.	355.738	383	.929		

Table 125c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 125a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.787*	.441
Mean 4 - Mean 6	.784*	.435
Mean 4 - Mean 2	.612*	.429
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.537*	.421
Mean 4 - Mean 1	.469*	.411
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.449*	.398
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.143	.378
Mean 8 - Mean 5	.644*	.435
Mean 8 - Mean 6	.641*	.429
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.469*	.421
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.394	.411
Mean 8 - Mean 1	.326	.398
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.306	.378
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.338	.429
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.335	.421
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.163	.411
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.088	.398
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.020	.378
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.318	.421
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.315	.411
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.143	.398
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.068	.378
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.250	.411
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.247	.398
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.075	.378
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.175	.398
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.172	.378
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.003	.378

As can be seen from the analysis of variance, there is a significant difference between groups. The mean scale position of all groups ranges between the "agree strongly" and the "agree" positions. Fewer of the male non users agree with this statement than is the case with any other group except for the female non users. The female non users agree significantly less strongly than do the female hippies and the male and female weekenders.

These minor group differences are far less striking than the the high rate of agreement shown among subjects in all groups. This ranges from 92% among the female weekenders to 70% among the male non users. Moreover, even among the male non users only 16% disagree with the statement.

Subjects were asked to rate their agreement with the statement: "Laws regulating sexual practices should be abolished." The analyses pertaining to these responses are shown below in Table 126.

Table 126a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to a Statement: "Laws regulating sexual practices should be abolished." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	1.551	.702
	2 Weekenders	48	1.604	.860
	3 Users	47	1.468	.821
	4 Non Users	50	2.020	1.010
Females	5 Hippies	47	1.340	.556
	6 Weekenders	50	1.340	.514
	7 Users	49	1.653	.959
	8 Non Users	49	2.204	1.069

Table 126b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 126a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	304.452	388			
Treat	33.334	7	4.762	6.692	
Factor 1	28.902	3	9.634	13.539	.01
Factor 2	.082	1	.082	.115	NS
1 Times 2	4.350	3	1.450	2.038	NS
Resid.	271.118	381	.712		

Table 126c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 126a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 8 - Mean 5	.864*	.386
Mean 8 - Mean 6	.864*	.381
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.736*	.375
Mean 8 - Mean 1	.653*	.369
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.600*	.360
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.551*	.348
Mean 8 - Mean 4	.184	.331
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.680*	.381
Mean 4 - Mean 6	.680*	.375
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.552*	.369
Mean 4 - Mean 1	.469*	.360
Mean 4 - Mean 2	.416*	.348
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.367*	.331
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.313	.375
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.313	.369
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.185	.360
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.102	.348
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.049	.331
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.264	.369
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.264	.360
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.136	.348
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.053	.331
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.211	.360
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.211	.348
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.083	.331
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.128	.348
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.128	.331
Mean 6 - Mean 5	.000	.331

The analysis of variance shows that there is a significant difference between groups, but not between the sexes. The male and female non users differ significantly from subjects in all the other groups, but they do not differ from each other. Once again, it should be noted that the mean scores for all groups indicate that the vast majority of subjects within all groups are in basic agreement with the statement. In other words, subjects in all groups feel

that the sexual practices of an individual should be a matter of his private concern, rather than of legislative fiat. Even among the non users 68% of the subjects are in agreement with this position. Only 13% are in disagreement.

It seems perfectly clear that subjects in all groups are in favor of sex information for teenagers and against legislative interference with the sexual practices of the individual. The differences on these issues between the non users and the other groups are genuinely differences in degree rather than in kind. The vast majority of all study subjects agree with the principle of individual determination the non users simply agree less strongly.

Supporting the view that subjects in all groups favor and desire dissemination of information about various aspects of sexuality are data presented in Table 127 below. Only the frequency distribution of responses is presented. Due to the large spread of these responses no statistical analyses were performed.

Table 127. Response Frequencies for Various Categories of Information Desired by Subjects.

		Menstruation	Pregnancy	Contraception	Abortions	Nocturnal Emissions	Masturbation	Where to find a good gynecologist	Frigidity	How to Handle a Strong Sex Drive	Homosexuality	Other	None of the Above
H	M	6 12%	6 12%	7 14%	9 18%	3 6%	3 6%	2 4%	5 10%	1 2%	5 10%	0 0%	0 0%
	F	0 0%	4 8%	5 10%	8 16%	2 4%	2 4%	5 10%	4 8%	3 6%	2 4%	1 2%	0 0%
W	M	3 6%	6 12%	5 10%	10 20%	3 6%	5 10%	4 8%	8 16%	7 14%	3 6%	1 2%	0 0%
	F	2 4%	11 22%	11 22%	18 36%	7 14%	7 14%	6 12%	10 20%	6 12%	7 14%	3 6%	0 0%
U	M	4 8%	6 12%	10 20%	9 18%	4 8%	4 8%	4 8%	5 10%	6 12%	8 16%	6 12%	0 0%
	F	1 2%	9 18%	7 14%	8 16%	3 6%	3 6%	5 10%	12 24%	10 20%	9 18%	0 0%	0 0%
NU	M	3 6%	11 22%	10 20%	7 14%	6 12%	5 10%	3 6%	3 6%	8 16%	5 10%	3 6%	0 0%
	F	3 6%	11 22%	15 29%	10 20%	3 6%	3 6%	6 12%	8 16%	9 18%	8 16%	4 8%	0 0%
Totals		22 6%	64 16%	70 18%	79 20%	31 8%	32 8%	35 9%	55 14%	50 13%	47 12%	18 5%	0 0%

1963

It is apparent that the areas in which additional information is desired by the greatest number of subjects are contraception and abortion. This is followed closely by a wish for further information about pregnancy. It is interesting that subjects in all groups want further information in more or less the same areas. In no group do the subjects feel so sophisticated that they report no need for further information. It is also noteworthy that in no group do more than one in three subjects feel that they require further information about any specific topic. Hence, in all groups the majority of subjects feel well-informed on these issues, but also in all groups there are some subjects who would like further information.

Subjects were asked to respond to a number of statements dealing with various aspects of sexual morality. First, subjects were asked to rate their agreement or disagreement with the statement: "There is nothing wrong with premarital sex." Analyses of the responses to this statement are presented in Table 128 below.

Table 128a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to Statement: "There is nothing wrong with premarital sex." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	1.490	.610
	2 Weekenders	47	1.702	.943
	3 Users	48	1.562	.761
	4 Non Users	48	2.208	.934
Females	5 Hippies	47	1.468	.896
	6 Weekenders	50	1.320	.508
	7 Users	47	1.660	.857
	8 Non Users	49	2.531	1.071

Table 128b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 128a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	329.543	384			
Treat	58.400	7	8.343	11.600	
Factor 1	52.108	3	17.369	24.151	.01
Factor 2	.004	1	.004	.006	NS
1 Times 2	6.287	3	2.096	2.914	NS
Resid.	271.143	377	.719		

Table 128c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 128a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 8 - Mean 6	1.211*	.388
Mean 8 - Mean 5	1.063*	.383
Mean 8 - Mean 1	1.041*	.377
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.969*	.370
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.871*	.362
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.829*	.350
Mean 8 - Mean 4	.323	.332
Mean 4 - Mean 6	.888*	.383
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.740*	.377
Mean 4 - Mean 1	.718*	.370
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.646*	.362
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.548*	.350
Mean 4 - Mean 2	.506*	.332
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.382*	.377
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.234	.370
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.212	.362
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.140	.350
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.042	.332
Mean 7 - Mean 6	.340	.370
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.192	.362
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.170	.350
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.098	.332
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.242	.362
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.094	.350
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.072	.332
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.170	.350
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.022	.332
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.148	.332

As can be seen from Table 128b, there is a highly significant difference between groups. The male and female non users differ significantly from every other group, but do not differ significantly from each other. Once again, the really noteworthy finding is that the majority of subjects in all groups, even the non-user groups, are accepting of the idea of premarital sex. Ninety-eight percent of the female weekenders express agreement with the statement; fifty-four percent of the female non users express agreement. However, only 20% of the female non users express disagreement.

Subjects were asked to rate their agreement or disagreement with the statement: "There is nothing wrong with extramarital sex." The analyses pertaining to this statement are presented in Table 129 below.

Table 129a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to Statement: "There is nothing wrong with extramarital sex." (1 = strongly agree)

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	47	2.362	1.175
	2 Weekenders	48	2.708	1.241
	3 Users	47	2.915	1.048
	4 Non Users	50	3.540	1.099
Females	5 Hippies	48	2.604	1.168
	6 Weekenders	49	2.286	1.107
	7 Users	49	3.327	1.095
	8 Non Users	50	3.520	1.118

Table 129b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 129a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	584.193	387			
Treat	86.611	7	12.373	9.449	
Factor 1	76.810	3	25.603	19.553	.01
Factor 2	.225	1	.225	.172	NS
1 Times 2	9.577	3	3.192	2.438	NS
Resid.	497.582	380	1.309		

Table 129c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 129a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 4 - Mean 6	1.254*	.523
Mean 4 - Mean 1	1.178*	.517
Mean 4 - Mean 5	.936*	.509
Mean 4 - Mean 2	.832*	.500
Mean 4 - Mean 3	.625*	.488
Mean 4 - Mean 7	.213	.472
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.020	.449
Mean 8 - Mean 6	1.234*	.517
Mean 8 - Mean 1	1.158*	.509
Mean 8 - Mean 5	.916*	.500
Mean 8 - Mean 2	.812*	.488
Mean 8 - Mean 3	.605*	.472
Mean 8 - Mean 7	.193	.449
Mean 7 - Mean 6	1.041*	.509
Mean 7 - Mean 1	.965	.500
Mean 7 - Mean 5	.723*	.488
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.619*	.472
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.412	.449
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.629*	.500
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.553*	.488
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.311	.472
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.207	.449
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.422	.488
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.346	.472
Mean 2 - Mean 5	.104	.449
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.318	.472
Mean 5 - Mean 1	.242	.449
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.076	.449

The results of the analysis of variance show that there is a highly significant group difference, but no sex difference. The responses to this item are interesting because this is the first item in this section in which the users show a significant difference from the hippie groups. The female users differ significantly from the hippies and the weekenders, but they do not differ significantly from the male users or from the non users. The male users differ only from the female weekenders and the male hippies.

The mean position of all groups shows that fewer subjects in all groups accept the idea of extramarital sex, than accept the idea of premarital sex. In fact, there is not a single group, even among the hippie subjects, in which the majority of subjects are in agreement with the idea of extramarital sex. Among the hippie groups, somewhat less than half of the subjects are in agreement; at least one-third express uncertainty. Among the male users, approximately one-third of the subjects are in agreement, another third are uncertain, and the final third disagree. Among the female users and the male and female non users the majority of subjects are not accepting of extramarital sex; only 20% of subjects in these groups do accept this notion.

Subjects were asked to respond to the statement: "Sex without love is meaningless." The analyses of responses pertaining to this statement are presented in Tables 130 below.

Table 130a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to Statement: "Sex without love is meaningless." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	3.122	1.256
	2 Weekenders	49	3.061	1.252
	3 Users	48	3.521	1.275
	4 Non Users	50	2.620	1.147
Females	5 Hippies	48	3.125	1.201
	6 Weekenders	49	2.878	1.223
	7 Users	50	2.740	1.180
	8 Non Users	50	2.320	1.207

Table 130b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 130a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	629.394	392			
Treat	46.538	7	6.648	4.391	
Factor 1	28.530	3	9.510	6.282	.01
Factor 2	9.756	1	9.756	6.444	.01
1 Times 2	8.253	3	2.751	1.817	NS
Resid.	582.856	385			

Table 130c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 130a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 3 - Mean 8	1.201*	.562
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.901*	.556
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.781*	.547
Mean 3 - Mean 6	.643*	.538
Mean 3 - Mean 2	.460	.525
Mean 3 - Mean 1	.399	.508
Mean 3 - Mean 5	.396	.482
Mean 5 - Mean 8	.805*	.556
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.505	.547
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.385	.538
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.247	.525
Mean 5 - Mean 2	.064	.508
Mean 5 - Mean 1	.003	.482
Mean 1 - Mean 8	.802*	.547
Mean 1 - Mean 4	.502	.538
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.382	.525
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.244	.508
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.061	.482
Mean 2 - Mean 8	.741*	.538
Mean 2 - Mean 4	.441	.525
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.321	.508
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.183	.482
Mean 6 - Mean 8	.558*	.525
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.258	.508
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.138	.482
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.420	.508
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.120	.482
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.300	.482

The results of the analysis of variance show a significant difference between groups, and between the sexes. The female non users differ significantly from all groups except the male non users in that they tend to express agreement with the statement. The female non users are the only group in which the majority (70%) of the subjects are in agreement with the traditional value placed on the relationship between love and sex. The male non users differ significantly only from the male users. This is a departure from the

typical response pattern of the male non users. In other words, this is the first item presented in this section on which the mean position of the male non users does not differ from that of subjects in all of the hippie groups. Almost half (44%) of the male non users are in agreement with the traditional relationship between love and sex.

Interestingly enough, the female users differ significantly only from the male users. Whereas 44% of the female users agree with the concept that love should accompany a sexual relationship, only 22% of the male users agree with this concept. In fact, 58% of the male subjects in this group disagree; they are the only group with a majority of subjects reporting in the"disagree"category.

The surprisingly large number of subjects in the hippie groups who agree with this statement (33%) is, in the light of other data, unlikely to be a function of an adherance to traditional morality; rather it may reflect their interpretation of the word "love." In other words, many hippies may feel, by their definition of love, that anyone with whom they are involved sexually is an object of their love.

In terms of conventional morality, then, the non users can be seen as the most conventional group although the majority of them do accept the idea of premarital sex. There is no group in which the majority of subjects accept the concept of extramarital sex. A large proportion of subjects in the hippie groups seems to place a positive value on marital fidelity. Similar to the acceptance of premarital sex, is the tendency for most subjects not to be in support of the traditional emphasis on the relationship between love and sex. In fact, only a majority of the female non users support this relationship. However, a large proportion of the subjects in the hippie groups do support the idea of sex in the context of a love relationship. Hence, it seems that the majority of subjects in all groups accept the idea of premarital sex, in the context of a love relationship. The attitude seems to be "if we love each other, why not?" But this attitude does not carry over into extramarital sex.

In order to obtain some measure of the respondents' views on the importance of sex as an issue in their lives and of their overall positive or hostile attitude toward sex, they were asked to respond to the statement: "Sex is highly over-rated." The analyses pertain-to this item are presented below in Table 131.

Table 131a. Mean Scores for All groups in Response to Statement: "Sex is highly over-rated." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	47	3.532	1.069
	2 Weekenders	50	3.400	1.166
	3 Users	48	3.375	1.033
	4 Non Users	50	3.180	1.211
Females	5 Hippies	48	3.708	.912
	6 Weekenders	50	3.520	1.269
	7 Users	49	3.469	1.214
	8 Non Users	49	2.878	1.100

Table 131b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 131a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	520.220	390			
Treat	22.022	7	3.146	2.419	
Factor 1	18.443	3	6.148	4.726	.01
Factor 2	.055	1	.055	.042	NS
1 Times 2	3.524	3	1.175	.903	NS
Resid.	498.198	383	1.301		

Table 131c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 131a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 5 - Mean 8	.830*	.521
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.528*	.515
Mean 5 - Mean 3	.333	.507
Mean 5 - Mean 2	.308	.498
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.239	.487
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.188	.471
Mean 5 - Mean 1	.176	.447
Mean 1 - Mean 8	.654*	.515
Mean 1 - Mean 4	.352	.507
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.157	.498
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.132	.487
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.063	.471
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.012	.447
Mean 6 - Mean 8	.642*	.507
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.340	.498
Mean 6 - Mean 3	.145	.487
Mean 6 - Mean 2	.120	.471
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.051	.447
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.591*	.498
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.289	.487
Mean 7 - Mean 3	.094	.471
Mean 7 - Mean 2	.069	.447
Mean 2 - Mean 8	.522*	.487
Mean 2 - Mean 4	.220	.471
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.025	.447
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.497*	.471
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.195	.447
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.302	.447

The analysis of variance shows that there is a significant difference between groups, but not between the sexes. This difference is primarily one between the female non users, and all other groups except the male non users. In fact, the male non users differ significantly only from the female hippies and fewer of the female hippies agree with this statement (10%) than is true of any other group. A majority of the subjects in all groups, with the exception of the female non users, disagree with this denigration of the central role of sexuality. Only 26% of subjects in the female non-user

group disagree with the statement.

Finally, in terms of another aspect of our inquiry into conventional morality among subjects in the various groups, subjects were asked to respond to the statement: "I don't respect girls who sleep around." The analyses of the responses to this item are presented in Table 132 below.

Table 132a. Mean Score for All Groups in Response to Statement: I don't respect girls who sleep around." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	3.796	1.088
	2 Weekenders	49	3.776	1.015
	3 Users	48	3.375	1.013
	4 Non Users	50	2.880	1.070
Females	5 Hippies	46	3.783	.998
	6 Weekenders	49	3.776	.953
	7 Users	50	3.200	1.095
	8 Non Users	51	2.824	.944

Table 132b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 132a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	471.388	391			
Treat	60.599	7	8.657	8.093	
Factor 1	59.765	3	19.922	18.622	.01
Factor 2	.500	1	.500	.467	NS
1 Times 2	.335	3	.112	.104	NS
Resid.	410.788	384	1.070		

Table 132c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented Above in Table 132a.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 1 - Mean 8	.972*	.473
Mean 1 - Mean 4	.916*	.476
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.596*	.460
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.421	.452
Mean 1 - Mean 2	.020	.441
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.020	.427
Mean 1 - Mean 5	.013	.406
Mean 5 - Mean 8	.959*	.467
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.903*	.460
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.583*	.452
Mean 5 - Mean 3	.408	.441
Mean 5 - Mean 2	.007	.427
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.007	.406
Mean 6 - Mean 8	.952*	.460
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.896*	.452
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.576*	.441
Mean 6 - Mean 3	.401	.427
Mean 6 - Mean 2	.000	.406
Mean 2 - Mean 8	.952*	.452
Mean 2 - Mean 4	.896*	.441
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.576*	.427
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.401	.406
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.551*	.441
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.495*	.427
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.175	.406
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.376	.427
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.320	.406
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.056	.406

As can be seen from Table 132b, there is a highly significant difference between the groups, but interestingly enough there is no difference between the sexes. The male and female non users differ significantly from all groups, with the exception of the female users. Whereas a third of both the female users and non users and 44% of the non user males are in agreement with this statement, only nine percent of all subjects in the hippie groups agree with this

statement. Similarly, only 16% of the male users agree with this statement. In fact, a majority of all subjects in the hippie groups disagree with the statement.

Subjects were then asked to respond to the statement: "I don't respect guys who sleep around." The analyses of these responses are presented in Table 133 below.

Table 133a. Mean Scores for All Groups in Response to Statement: "I don't respect guys who sleep around." (1 = strongly agree).

Treatment Group		No. of Subjects	Mean	S.D.
Males	1 Hippies	49	3.837	1.094
	2 Weekenders	49	3.878	.982
	3 Users	48	3.646	.878
	4 Non Users	49	3.204	1.030
Females	5 Hippies	48	3.875	.971
	6 Weekenders	49	3.714	.969
	7 Users	50	3.500	.943
	8 Non Users	51	3.039	.928

Table 133b. Analysis of Variance of Data Presented in Table 133a.

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Total	409.562	392			
Treat	34.993	7	4.999	5.138	
Factor 1	33.105	3	11.035	11.342	.05
Factor 2	1.317	1	1.317	1.353	NS
1 Times 2	.572	3	.191	.196	NS
Resid.	374.569	385	.973		

Table 133c. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to Data Presented in Table 133c.

Difference Between Means		.05 Level Shortest Significant Range
Mean 5 - Mean 8	.855*	.451
Mean 5 - Mean 4	.690*	.445
Mean 5 - Mean 7	.394	.439
Mean 5 - Mean 3	.248	.431
Mean 5 - Mean 6	.180	.421
Mean 5 - Mean 1	.057	.407
Mean 5 - Mean 2	.016	.387
Mean 2 - Mean 8	.839*	.445
Mean 2 - Mean 4	.674*	.439
Mean 2 - Mean 7	.378	.431
Mean 2 - Mean 3	.232	.421
Mean 2 - Mean 6	.164	.407
Mean 2 - Mean 1	.041	.387
Mean 1 - Mean 8	.798*	.439
Mean 1 - Mean 4	.633*	.431
Mean 1 - Mean 7	.337	.421
Mean 1 - Mean 3	.191	.407
Mean 1 - Mean 6	.123	.387
Mean 6 - Mean 8	.675*	.431
Mean 6 - Mean 4	.510*	.421
Mean 6 - Mean 7	.214	.407
Mean 6 - Mean 3	.068	.387
Mean 3 - Mean 8	.607*	.421
Mean 3 - Mean 4	.442*	.407
Mean 3 - Mean 7	.146	.387
Mean 7 - Mean 8	.461*	.407
Mean 7 - Mean 4	.296	.387
Mean 4 - Mean 8	.165	.387

The significant differences between groups are not nearly as strong as in response to the previous item. The male and female non users differ significantly from all other groups. The pattern of responses to this statement is not very different from the pattern of responses to the previous statement about not respecting girls who "sleep around." Nine percent of the subjects in the hippie groups agree with the statement when it is about girls, seven percent agree when it is about guys. Thus it seems that among the hippies, at

least in terms of professed attitudes, the double standard is dead. The non-user males and females and the user females show the greatest degree of agreement with the statement when it is applied to females; they show considerably less agreement when it is applied to males. For instance, whereas 32% of the user females and 44% of the non-user males agree with the statement when applied to females, only 16% of the user females and 24% of the non-user males agree with it when it is applied to men. Hence, it seems that the double standard, while not upheld strongly by these groups, is still present to some extent.

SUMMARY

1) The majority of subjects feel that sex is important to them, and they do not feel guilty or excessively anxious about their sexual adequacy or behavior. Nevertheless, a substantial number of hippies as well as non hippies experience difficulties in this area.

2) Similarly, the majority of subjects in all groups do not condemn premarital sex, but they do feel that sex should be part of a love relationship. The majority of subjects do not condone the practice of extramarital sex.

3) The double standard, in terms of acceptance of promiscuity by men but not by women is not supported by the majority of the subjects. However, the proportion of subjects who show no allegiance to the double standard is highest among the more liberal groups, e.g., the hippies, weekenders, and male users.

4) The vast majority of subjects in the hippie groups, and in the male user group have had sexual intercourse. Among a substantial proportion of males, particularly hippies and users, the first sexual experience was with someone they had known for only a day. Among hippie females and both groups of weekenders the largest number report a first sexual experience after a month. A substantial number of non users and of female users have never had intercourse. Among the females who have had intercourse, relationships of at least a month's duration are far more common. Among the males, shorter term relationships are just as common as those of at least a month's duration.

5) The position of all subjects on most issues is a liberal and tolerant one. The majority of all subjects support the idea of abortion, are in favor of personal over legislative control of sexual practices and feel that teenagers should be given information about contraception. A number of subjects in all groups indicate that they would like more information about contraception and abortions.

6) The major and most outstanding finding in this section is the consistent agreement between all subjects on most attitudinal items. While the non users tend to differ from all of the other groups, these differences are almost invariably differences in degree rather than in kind.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

E. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. Purposes of the study:

The study was designed to provide descriptive data on several samples of drug users and to compare these with non-drug users. The study focused on the characteristics of four groups: hippies, weekend hippies ("weekenders"), non-hippie drug users, and non-hippie non-users.

Information was collected from study participants to provide descriptive data in the following areas: family backgrounds, their drug orientation and practices, attitudes and beliefs reflecting alienation, and their sexual orientation and practices.

II. Study sample:

The segment of the study sample defined as "hippies" had to meet all of the following criteria:

1. Self-perceived alienation from the goals and values of society.

2. Self-identification as hippies or "free men."

3. Identification and/or sympathy with a specific group of hippies, e.g., "diggers," "provos."

4. A life style, including dress and abode, which was that commonly associated with the hippies.

5. Identification with the "drug scene."

The other sample groups, namely "weekenders" and non-hippie users (referred to simply as users) and non-hippie non-users (ref-ferred to simply as non-users) are defined in this report.

The total study population consisted of 465 individuals of whom 219 were hippies and weekenders, and 246 were users and non-users. The age range of the respondents was 14 to 35, with most being in their late teens or early twenties. Approximately half the respondents were male, and half female.

III. Methodology:

A highly structured interview schedule was administered individually to study respondents by trained interviewers. Hippie interviewers were recruited from the hippie community to work with hippies and weekenders in the East Village of New York City. For the non-hippie respondent groups, subjects were recruited from the

membership of the Community Centers operated by the Associated YM-YWHAs of Greater New York. These subjects were interviewed by staff members of the Center for Community Research, who also provided training and supervision to the hippie interviewers.

The study has the following limitations:

1. The study was designed as a preliminary descriptive survey to learn about the characteristics of a given target population. It was not designed to test predictions, or to engage in hypothesis testing.

2. Some liberties have been taken in the imposition of certain statistical analyses. There are dangers inherent in the application of Chi Square tests in cases where cell frequencies are as low as some found in the data reported. However, it was felt that any such dangers were far outweighed by the ability of such tests to provide a clear, and more comprehensible picture, along the dimensions being tapped. Likewise, the application of the Duncan Multiple Range Test in the case of unequal cell entries also must raise some methodological questions; however, as was explained in the text, there is reason to believe that the errors, if any, would be small.

3. The study report describes phenomena which existed during 1969-70. Thus, currently existing phenomena may in some respects be different. Moreover, the study definition of drug use already appears to be somewhat naive and dated.

IV. Major findings:

A. Family background and demographic characteristics:

1. Male hippies, and weekenders of both sexes, came from less socially prestigious, less well-to-do family backgrounds than did the non-users and, in particular, the users. However, the majority of Ss in all groups come from middle or upper class families.

2. The female hippies often do come from fairly affluent family backgrounds. They are the only group which reflect the popularized notion of "hippiedom" as a flight from affluence.

3. The users, like the female hippies, come from relatively affluent family backgrounds. The users come from families of higher socioeconomic status than do non-users.

4. A relatively large number of hippies and weekenders are school dropouts, as contrasted with users or non-users. Among the dropouts, most dropped out either in senior high school or during the first year of college. The weekender females are most highly represented in the dropout category.

5. The hippies and weekenders profess the least religious allegiance among all groups studied. Forty percent of the hippies and weekenders are of Jewish origin. Non-users are the most religiously observant group. Among all groups, there is a drop in religious observances and affiliations. This trend is most marked across all study groups among Ss of Jewish origins.

6. A relatively large number of hippie respondents come from religiously mixed marriages.

7. Politically, the hippies, weekenders, and users can be characterized as "left" of the non-users. There are no striking differences found among the parents of subjects in the various groups.

8. There is a marked tendency toward family tensions among the families of hippies and weekenders, in terms of broken families, frequency of arguments, and relative lack of family closeness. Many of their homes are characterized by instability, tension, and breakdown. For example, over half the female hippies come from broken homes. In contrast, the users and non-users come from relatively more stable homes which are characterized by a feeling of family unity and a relative absence of arguments.

9. More subjects among the hippies and weekenders smoke, but fewer use alcohol than is the case among the users and the non-users. No differences were found in terms of drinking habits of the parents of subjects in the four groups. However, more of the hippies report instances of family members who have a drug- or alcohol-related problem.

B. Drug orientation and practices:

For the purpose of the study a drug user was defined as one who used marijuana or hashish once a month, or who reported using any other drug (LSD, methadrine, DMT, STP, opium, etc.) on more than two occasions.

1. The average age of all drug users in this study was 22; the average age of first marijuana use was 19.

2. The hippies use more drugs than any other group, followed by the weekenders, and trailed by the users. The latter use primarily marijuana and hashish; relatively few of them are involved with any other drugs. It is important to note that the user group has been involved with marijuana for about three years, yet they have by and large not gone on to other drug use.

3. Drug use is primarily a peer group phenomenon. Most drug users of all kinds are initated into drug use by their close friends; they use marijuana in small groups of friends. The popular image of the marijuana user as a pusher of drugs onto the uninitiated is not supported by these data. Most drug users learn about drugs from their friends, and the opinions of their friends are more important to them than the opinions of anyone else. Most of a drug user's friends are not opposed to drug use.

4. Only ten percent of subjects reported feeling "miserable" just prior to their initiation into drug use. Another 45% state that they had some problem(s) at this time. The hippies and weekenders are more likely to see themselves as having problems than was the users. The overall impression is that the majority of drug users did not turn to drugs because of feelings of despair and misery.

5. Among subjects who acknowledged problems prior to initial drug use, the most commonly reported problems were: feelings of detachment from society, lack of meaningfulness in their lives, lack of direction, and lack of attachment to one person. Feelings of sadness or tension, inability to get along with family, and problems in school are prevalent. These problems are common to all drug users, i.e., no problem is specific to a particular group.

6. The majority of drug users reported that their first drug experience, which was most typically with marijuana, was a pleasurable one.

7. All drug users, whether they used a particular substance or not, show high agreement regarding the properties they attributed to the substance. In addition, they were well aware of differences between various substances. Marijuana and hashish were described as more positive attributes by more people than any other drug, including alcohol.

8. Bad trips were reported by 15% of marijuana users, and by 36% of LSD users. However, bad trips did not seem to be a very important deterrent in terms of further use. The most frequent reasons given for termination of use were "loss of interest" and "fear of physical damage." Since many drug users stated that they had tried a particular drug out of curiosity about its effects, many seemed to terminate use once this curiosity had been satisfied. It seems also that in the case of those drugs where the possibility of physical damage has been clearly established and well publicized, fear of damage acted as a deterrent for some users.

9. Approximately 75% of all drug-using respondents report having been first exposed to marijuana. The vast majority (82%) of drug-using respondents report current or prior use of hashish, this being the second or third drug of exposure. A minority of respondents (38%) use or have used mescalin, with hippies being the highest users. Current or past use of LSD was reported by 70% of the hippies, and 58% of the weekenders. Current or previous use of heroin was reported by 22% of the hippies, 20% of the weekenders, and 8% of users. About 25% of all respondents

report current or prior use of barbiturates and methadrine. Other amphetamines were used by over 40% of hippies and weekenders, and 19% of users. The use of cocaine was reported by 52% of the hippies, by 33% of the weekenders, and by 17% of users.

C. Alienation:

For the purpose of this study, alienation has been defined as a loss or lack of relatedness with people, institutions, and values of the external society where some form of relationship might normally be expected.

1. One of the most important, if not the most important concomitants of drug use and "dropping out" were feelings of alienation from family, from society, and from major societal institution.

2. The feelings of alienation among the various user groups were accompanied in most instances, by a desire to effect some change in the order of society. Interestingly, while among the hippie and weekender groups such change was often seen as attainable only through revolution, within the user group, change was to be sought through peaceful, more traditional means.

3. As would be expected, the hippie group rejected the traditional American value structure, placing as it does emphasis upon achievement through work, attainment of material goals, etc. The user group was relatively more tolerant of American values; however, it is to be noted that all groups, both user and non-user, presented a profound concern with the "American way of life." Certainly the discontent with the current "scene," characteristic of the hippies, is not confined to that group alone. Rather, it would seem that the role of the hippies has been to catalyze, crystalize, and embody the malaise of a generation, and a society.

4. In terms of relationships with mothers, the least amicable feelings were reported by female respondents - hippies, weekenders, and users. By contrast, non-user females see themselves closer to their mothers than does any other group. In general, the self-perceived relationship to mothers of all drug user groups tends to be neither amicable nor hostile; rather, it may be characterized as one of neutrality.

5. In terms of relationships with fathers, male hippies and weekenders perceived themselves as detached from fathers. Non-users were significantly more attached to their fathers than were all groups of users.

6. A majority of hippies and weekenders reported feelings of being an "outsider" to their parental families.

7. A large number of hippies reported they have "no best friend" and have no relationships of long standing with friends. They do have, however, an incredibly large number of "friends." There is some evidence of an inability to establish close personal ties.

8. Subjects in the hippie groups described themselves as alienated from the major institutions of society: government, family, school. While many subjects in the non-hippie groups, particularly the users, also saw themselves as alienated and disaffected, the hippies were more likely to favor the downfall of the institutions which they criticize. While subjects in all groups were critical of government and family, a significantly larger number of hippies favored revolution and the replacement of the family with another system. Perhaps differences between the groups may be characterized as follows: the non-users tended to be accepting of the social institutions; the users tended to be critical, but did not favor the downfall of the institutions; the hippie groups were critical and in favor of terminating the institutions as they currently exist. Similarly, the users admired leaders who have worked for social change within the system; the hippie groups admired revolutionaries.

9. Subjects in the hippie groups tended to reject traditional American values related to an emphasis on material success, work, and planning for the future. The users were somewhat ambivalent in their responses, but tend to define success in terms of traditional concepts, e.g., education, job status, and family life. The non-users were generally accepting of this framework.

D. Experience with and attitudes toward sexuality:

1. The majority of subjects felt that sex is important to them, and they did not feel guilty or excessively anxious about their sexual adequacy or behavior. Nevertheless, a substantial number of hippies as well as non-hippies experienced difficulties in this area.

2. Similarly, the majority of subjects in all groups did not condemn premarital sex, but they did feel that sex should be part of a love relationship. The majority of subjects did not condone the practice of extramarital sex.

3. The double standard, in terms of acceptance of promiscuity by men but not by women was not supported by the majority of the subjects. However, the proportion of subjects who showed no allegiance to the double standard was highest among the more liberal groups, e.g., the hippies, weekenders, and male users.

4. The vast majority of subjects in the hippie groups, and in the male user group have had sexual intercourse. Among a substantial proportion of males, particularly hippies and users, the first sexual experience was with someone they had known for only a day. Among hippie females and both groups of weekenders, the largest number reported a first sexual experience after a month. A substantial number of non-users and of female users have never had intercourse. Among the females who have had intercourse, relationships of at least a month's duration were far more common. Among the males, shorter term relationships were just as common as those of at least a month's duration.

5. The position of all subjects on most issues was a liberal and tolerant one. The majority of all subjects supported the idea of abortion, were in favor of personal over legislative control of sexual practices and felt that teenagers should be given information about contraception. A number of subjects in all groups indicated that they would like more information about contraception and abortions.

6. The major and most outstanding finding in this section was the consistent agreement between all subjects on most attitudinal items. While the non-users tended to differ from all of the other groups, these differences were almost invariably differences in degree rather than in kind.

V. Some final thoughts:

Throughout the data, many differences among the groups studied tended to be differences of degree rather than kind. This is particularly true when contrasting the user group with the hippies. Certainly this is true with regard to sexuality; it appears equally true with regard to perhaps the most important single study dimension, i.e., alienation. We seem to be addressing ourselves to the examination of a continuum of attitude and practice, rather than to a comparison of properties, among totally different groups.

From the data available, it is not possible to establish any causal relationships among the factors studied. On the basis of these data, it is suggested however that further research efforts be devoted to examining more closely the antecedents to, and concomitants of, alienation. It is suggested, for example, that families be studied, in longitudinal fashion so as to trace more closely the possible causation of growing feelings of alienation, as well as the possible outcomes of such feelings of alienation. Particularly in the light of certain of the data discussed in this report, it is suggested that an investigation be made of the relationship between parental goals and goal fulfillment, particularly as these relate to family tensions. This in turn should be related to the nature and adequacy of the role models made available by parents to growing children. These factors may play a crucial role in the development of feelings of alienation. Highly related to this, it is suggested that further investigations focus upon family stability, harmony, and marital happiness as possible influences on feelings of alienation.

It is suggested that further research focus not so much on drug user per se, but upon those factors which, in the context of a drug oriented society, culminate in activities destructive to self and society. It has been impossible, to date, to develop a satisfactory definition of drug use, let alone abuse, for the very reason that these terms have meaning only in the context of a particular individual, at a particular time, in a particular situation. This being the case, it would seem most potentially fruitful to examine those intra-familial and personality factors which culminate in the use or abuse, and which, in point of fact, determine whether use, or abuse, is actually taking place.